



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





600088167-











# INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION :

BEING

## A REVIEW

OF

SEVEN SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,  
BY THE REV. JOHN WILLIAM BURGON, M.A., FELLOW OF  
ORIEL COLLEGE, AND SELECT PREACHER :

WITH

SOME REMARKS UPON "THE BEGINNING OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS,"  
BY THE REV. ISAAC WILLIAMS.

BY THE REV. AUGUSTUS CLISSOLD, M.A.,

FORMERLY OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

No. I.

19  
"I am not sure that since the days of the Arian dispute, a more important question has arisen than that which seems likely to be ere long forcing itself upon us, of the Inspiration of Holy Writ."—*Sermons preached at St. Mary's, Oxford, by the Rev. B. P. Eden*, p. 173.

OXFORD :  
HENRY HAMMANS, HIGH STREET.

LONDON :  
WHITTAKER AND CO.

1861.

130. f. 57.



LONDON :  
MITCHELL AND SON, PRINTERS,  
WARDOUR STREET, W.



## INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION.

---

At last a crisis has arrived ! The trumpet has been blown ; and has given no uncertain sound. The foundation of the Church—the Word of God—has, it is said, been openly attacked ; the authority of the Bible, and that of the Church, have both been directly assaulted ; both, it is said, will be in imminent danger, if the *Essays and Reviews* are allowed to prevail. A series of Seven Sermons, from the University pulpit, has accordingly been preached, addressed principally to the Undergraduates ; and nothing, we think, has ever issued from the Church of England of such supreme importance on the subject of Divine Inspiration. As far, however, as regards the *Inspiration* and *Interpretation* of Scripture, Mr. Noble,\* in his work on *Plenary Inspiration*, long since maintained the same *general* principles with those of Mr. Burgon. Without reference, however, to this topic, we thank Mr. Burgon for his services to the cause of Truth ; although we feel that his main position is so strong, that he might have afforded to discuss the ques-

\* *The Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures Asserted, and the Principles of their Composition Investigated, with a view to the Refutation of all objections to their Divinity.* In Six Lectures. By the Rev. S. Noble. Third Edition.

tion in a far more respectful and amicable spirit toward the Essayists and Reviewers. It is, however, but just that we should listen to his *reasons* for plain speaking; and accordingly the following remarks are interesting as a specimen of what has been preached from a University pulpit, and this very recently (p. 57):—

—“The record of the Apostle is express and emphatic:—‘All Scripture (every book of the Bible) is given *by inspiration of God*.’ In the face of such testimony, by the way, we deem it not a little extraordinary to be assured (by an individual who has acquired considerable notoriety within the last few months) that ‘for any of the higher or supernatural views of Inspiration, there is no foundation in the Gospels or Epistles.’\* ”

“Strange to say, there is a marvellous indisposition in man to admit the notion of such a heaven-sent message. Not to dispute with those who deny Inspiration altogether, (for that would be endless,) there are many,—and we fear, a daily increasing number of persons,—who, admitting Inspiration in terms, yet so mutilate the notion of it, that their admission becomes a practical lie. ‘St. Paul was inspired, no doubt, so was Shakspeare.’ He who says this, intending no quibble, declares that in his belief St. Paul was *not inspired at all*.

“But this is a monstrous case, with which I will not waste your time. Far more numerous are they, who, admitting that the authors of the Bible were inspired in quite a different sense from Homer and Dante, are yet for modifying and qualifying this admission after so many strange and arbitrary fashions, that the residuum of their belief is really worth very little. One man has a mental reservation of exclusion in favour of the two Books of Chronicles, or the Book of Esther, or of Daniel.—Another is content to eliminate from

\* Rev. B. Jowett, in *Essays and Reviews*, p. 345.

the Bible those passages which seem to him to run counter to the decrees of physical science; the history of the Six Days of Creation,—of the Flood,—of the destruction of Sodom,—and of Joshua's address to Sun and Moon.—Another regards it as self-evident that nothing is trustworthy which savors supremely of the marvellous;—as the Temptation of our first parents,—the Manna in the Wilderness,—Balaam reproved by the dumb Ass,—and the history of Jonah.—There are others who cannot tolerate the Miracles of the Old and New Testament. The more timid explain away as much of them as they dare. What remains, troubles them. The more logical sweep them away altogether. A miracle (they say) cannot be true, because it implies a violation of the fixed and immutable laws of Nature.

“And then (so strangely constituted are some men's minds), there are not a few persons who, without exactly denying the inspiration of the Bible in any of its more marvellous portions—(for *that* would be an inconvenient proceeding),—are yet content to regard much of it as a kind of inspired myth. This is a class of ally (?) with whom one really knows not how to deal. The man does not reason. He assumes his right to disbelieve, and yet will not allow that he is an unbeliever. The world is singularly indulgent toward persons of this unphilosophical, illogical, presumptuous class.

“Now I shall have something to say to all these different kinds of objectors, on some subsequent occasion. But I shall be rendering the younger men a far more important service if, to-day, I address my remarks to a different class of objectors altogether: *that* far larger body, I mean, who, without at all desiring to impugn the Inspiration of God's Oracles, yet make no secret of their belief that the Bible is full of inaccuracies and mis-statements. These men ascribe a truly liberal amount of human infirmity to the authors of the several Books of the Bible;—slips of memory, miscon-



ceptions, imperfect intelligence, partial illumination, and so forth;—and, under one or other of those heads, include whatever they are themselves disposed to reject. The writers who come in for the largest share of this indulgence, are the Evangelists; because the historians of our Lord's life having happily left us four versions of the same story, and often three versions of the same transaction, the evidence whereby *they* may be convicted of error is in the hands of all. Truly mankind has not been slow to avail itself of the opportunity. You will seldom hear a gospel difficulty discussed, without a quiet assumption on the part of the reverend gentleman that *he* knows all about the matter in question, but that the Evangelist did not. His usual method is calmly to inform us that it is useless to look for strict consistency in matters of minute detail; that *general agreement* between the four Evangelists there does exist, and *that* ought to be enough. The inevitable inference from his manner of handling the Gospels, is, that if his actual thoughts could find candid expression, we should hear him address their blessed authors somewhat as follows: 'You are four highly respectable characters, no doubt; and you *mean* well. But it cannot be expected that persons of your condition in life should have described so many intricate transactions so minutely without making blunders. I do not say it unkindly. I often make blunders myself,—I, who have a 'clearness of understanding,' a 'power of discrimination between different kinds of Truth,'\* unknown to the Apostolic age!'. . . Of course the preacher does not *say* all this. He has too keen a sense of 'the dignity of the pulpit.' And so he puts it somewhat thus:—'While we are disposed to recognize substantial agreement, and general conformity in respect of details, among the synoptical witnesses in their leading external outlines, we are yet constrained to withhold our unqualified acceptance of any theory of Inspiration, which

\* Dr. Temple in *Essays and Reviews*, p. 25.

should claim for these compilers exemption from the oscitancy, and generally from the infirmities of humanity.' . . . This sounds fine, you know ; and is thought an ingenious way of wrapping up the charge which the reverend preacher brings against the Evangelists ;—of having, in plain terms,—*made blunders*.

"It will be convenient that we should narrow the ground to this single issue, for the time is short. And in the remarks I am about to offer, I shall not imitate the example of those preachers who dress out an easy thought in a superfluity of inflated language, only in order that its deformity may escape detection. Be not surprised if I speak to you this morning in uncommonly plain English ; for I am determined that the simplest person present shall understand at least what *I* mean. The dignity of the blessed Evangelists, who walked with Jesus, and whom Jesus loved,—the dignity of that Gospel which I believe to be penetrated through and through with the Holy Spirit of God,—for *that*, I confess to a most unbounded jealousy. As for the 'dignity of the pulpit,' I hate the very phrase ! It has been made too often the shield of impiety and the cloke of dulness.

"To begin, then : Is it, I would ask you, a reasonable anticipation that the narrative of one inspired by God would prove full of inconsistencies, mis-statements, slips of memory ; or, indeed, that it should contain *any* mis-statements, *any* inaccuracies at all ? What, then, is the difference between an inspired and an uninspired writing—the Word of God and the word of man ?"

In the sequel of the same discourse, Mr. Burgon makes some remarks on the alleged opposition between Science and Theology ; and after observing that Theology is itself a Science,—nay, the queen and mistress of all other Sciences, but that the latter have become insubordinate, he observes (p. 80) :—

“When Language impugns those Oracles which she was hired to decipher, and pretends to doubt the Inspiration of that Book of which, confessedly, she barely understands the grammar; when History and Chronology cry out that the annals of Theology are false, and her record of Time a fable;—that the Deluge, for instance, is an old wife’s story, and the economy of times and seasons a human fabrication;—when Astronomical and Mechanical Science strut up to the throne whereon sits the Ancient of Days,—prate to Him (the first Author of Law) about the ‘supremacy of law,’ and tell Him to His face that His miracles are things impossible; when Physiology insinuates that mankind cannot be descended from one primæval pair, and that the lives of the Patriarchs cannot be such as they are recorded to have been; when the pretender to Natural Philosophy\* gravely assures us that we ought not to pray for fair weather, because the weather depends not upon ‘arbitrary changes in the will of God,’ *but* upon laws as fixed and certain ‘as the laws of gravitation,’—which, mark you, Sirs, is no longer a dry verbal speculation, but is nothing less than an invasion of that inner chamber where you or I have retired to pour out the fulness of an aching heart in prayer that God would prolong, if it may be, the life of the dearest thing we have on earth, and rudely to bid us rise from our knees and be silent, for that the health of man depends not on the will of God, but on fixed physiological laws; lastly, when the pretender to Geological skill denies the authenticity of the first chapter of Genesis,—which is to deny the Inspiration of all the rest, and therefore of the whole Bible,—and thus to rob life’s weary pilgrim of that rod and staff concerning which he has many a time exclaimed ‘*They comfort me!*’—whenever, as now, such things are spoken and printed,—not in a corner, and by insignificant persons, and in ambiguous language; but in plain English,

\* See Mr. Kingsley’s Sermon on “Prayer for Fair Weather.”

by clergymen and scholars in authority, openly in the face of God's sun;—then it is high time, even for the humblest and least among you,—if no man of mark will speak up and speak out for God's truth,—to deliver a plain message with that freedom which Englishmen hold to be a part of their birthright. It should breed no offence, I say, if the most unworthy of God's servants, here, before you all,—before these younger men especially, who have been drawn hither by the fame of your piety and your learning, and who have been entrusted to your guardianship through the precious years of early manhood, with a well-grounded confidence that you would give them to eat not only of the Tree of Knowledge, but also largely of the fruit of the Tree of Life,—in this Holy House,\* too, where he received his commission, and vowed before God and man that he would 'be ready (the Lord being his helper), with all faithful diligence to drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word:—before *such* an audience, and in such a place, it must and *shall* be lawful for me solemnly to denounce as false and deadly, full of nothing but pernicious consequence, that system of practical Infidelity which enjoys such unhappy popularity at this hour; which, under the mask of Science, and under the specious name of Progress, is spreading like a fatal contagion through the length and breadth of the land, and which, if suffered to go unchastised and unchecked, will end by shaking both the Altar and the Throne! . . . Look well to it, Sirs, if you care for the safety of the Ark of God. For my part,—like one of old time, whose words I am not worthy to take upon my lips,—'I cannot hold my peace, because thou hast heard, O my soul, the sound of the trumpet, the alarm of war!'

"The case is not altered,—rather is it made worse,—if this hostility to God's truth proceeds from persons bearing

\* Christ Church Cathedral.

Orders in the English Church. ('O my soul, come not thou into their secret!') The case is not altered: for the requirements of Physical Science are still the plea; and *divines*, in *no* sense, these men are, however unsuccessful they may prove in establishing their claim to the title of *philosophers* either. Nay, Sirs, suffer one of yourselves to ask you, whether these disgraceful developments are not the lawful result of your own incredible system, of sending forth, year by year, men to be teachers and professors of Divinity,—to whom you have yet never imparted *any theological training whatever*."

Mr. Burgon observes, in a note, that this complaint is a very old one, as may be seen in Bishop Pearson's *Minor Works*, vol. i., p. 429, where great lamentation is made over the neglected study of Theology. The answer to this has been, that Oxford is not properly a Theological University; and, besides, that the deficiency has been attempted to be supplied by Diocesan Theological Colleges—institutions however which will be of little avail, so long as Theology itself is in so unsettled a state.

There are other remarks in these Sermons expressing a strong reprobation of the teaching contained in the *Essays and Reviews*, but which, unhappily, are so vehement, if not personal, that although delivered from the University pulpit, we think it better not to admit them into these pages. The *Essays and Reviews* have their mission, say what we may against them. The writers have honestly spoken out their real sentiments, and have faithfully indicated the goal toward which modern Theology has for a long time been tending. One thing, accordingly, is obvious, that the Preacher is not one of those who look with

placid indifference upon the present crisis : he is not one of those easy, *let-alone* divines who think that too much notice has been taken of the subject, and that it has been argued into a fictitious importance by pugnacious opponents. On the contrary, he seems to be aware of what is said to be the fact, viz., that there is, for some reason, a falling off in the supply of candidates for Orders in the Church of England, at least among young men of ability. Some have attributed this to the present unsettled state of Theology,—some to the spread of positive Infidelity. Hence one reason, doubtless, for which these Lectures on the *Inspiration* and *Interpretation* of the Bible are so earnestly addressed to Undergraduates.

We now proceed to the *general* principles of *Inspiration* and *Interpretation* which these Sermons advocate, and to offer some remarks upon them.

On the subject of the Plenary Inspiration of the Bible, Mr. Burgon is very explicit ; and takes care to guard his readers against the popular error, that man and not God is the author of the Bible. “I invite you,” says he,\* “as the only intelligible view of the matter,—your only alternative, unless you resolve to run the risk of the most irrational rationalism,—to take this high view of Inspiration : to believe concerning the Bible, that it is in the most literal sense imaginable, verily and indeed *the Word* of God.”—“We are always to remember, that the *true* Author of either Testament,—the *real* Author of every part of the Bible, is (not Man, but)

\* See pages 120, 173, 116.

God!" He observes, that "the sacred writers were all, however unconsciously, held by the Ancient of Days within the hollow of His palm; and as Augustin says,—‘Whatsoever He willed that we should read concerning His acts and sayings,—that He commissioned the Evangelists to write,—as though it had been Himself that wrote it.’ The guidance was remote, I grant you . . . but, for all that, the long sequence of cause and effect existed; and the other end of that golden chain which terminated in the man, and the pen, and the ink, and the paper,—the other end of it, I say, was held fast within the Hand of God."

These principles being laid down in the most positive and uncompromising manner, lead him to adopt views of Inspiration very different from those which are commonly received. Thus (p. 76) :—

"No, Sirs! The Bible (be persuaded) is the very utterance of the Eternal, as much God's Word, as if high Heaven were open, and we heard God speaking to us with human voice. . . . The Bible, from the Alpha to the Omega of it, is filled to overflowing with the Holy Spirit of God: the Books of it, and the sentences of it, and the words of it, and the syllables of it,—aye, and the very letters of it. 'Nihil in Scripturis est otiosum,' (said the great Casaubon): 'non dictio, non dictionis forma, non syllaba, non litera.'"

Therefore, says Mr. Burgon (p. 89) :—

. . . "*This* day's sermon has had for its object to remind you, that THE BIBLE is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the Throne! Every Book of it,—every Chapter of it,—every Verse of it,—every word of it,—every syllable of it,—(*where* are we to stop?)—every letter of it—

is the direct utterance of the Most High! 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.' Well spake the HOLY GHOST, by the mouth of the many blessed men who wrote it.—The Bible is none other than *the Word of God*: not some part of it more, some part of it less; but all alike, the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the Throne;—absolute,—faultless,—unerring,—supreme."

Again (p. 93):—

"Some here present may remember my repeated and unequivocal assertion that Holy Scripture is inspired from the Alpha to the Omega of it;—not some parts more, some parts less, but all equally, and all to overflowing;—that we hold it to be, not generally inspired, but particularly; that we see not how with logical consistency we can avoid believing the words as well as the sentences of it; the syllables as well as the words; the letters as well as the syllables; every 'jot' and every 'tittle' of it (to use our Lord's expression), to be divinely inspired:—and further, that until the contrary has been *proved*, we shall maintain that no misapprehension or mis-statement, no error or blot of any kind, can possibly exist within its pages:—that we hold the Bible to be as much the Word of God, as if God spoke to us therein with human lips;—and that, as the very utterance of the HOLY GHOST, we cannot *but* think that it must be absolute, faultless, unerring, supreme!"

In the sequel, however, the Preacher observes (p. 183):—

"It is quite marvellous in how many different ways different classes of professing Christians have contrived to nullify the value of their admission that the Bible is *inspired*. Some would distinguish the inspiration of the Historical Book from that of those which we call Prophetical. Others profess to lay their finger on what are *the proper subjects* of



Inspiration and what are not. Some are for a general superintending guidance which yet did not effectually guide; while others represent the sacred writers as subject, in what they delivered, to the conditions of knowledge in the age where their lot was cast. The view of Inspiration which Scripture itself gives us,—namely, that *GOD is therein speaking by human lips*; so that ‘holy men of God’ delivered themselves as they were ‘impelled,’ ‘borne along,’ or ‘lifted up’ (*pheromenoi*) by the HOLY GHOST;\*—this plain account of the matter, I say, which converts all ‘Scripture’ into something ‘breathed into by GOD,’ (*theopneustos*)—men are singularly slow to acknowledge. The methods which they have devised in order to escape from so plain a revealed Truth, are ‘Legion.’”

Mr. Burgon further maintains that all parts of the Scripture are inspired. Thus (p. 114):—

“—While you read the Bible, read it believing that you are reading an inspired Book;—not a Book inspired in parts only, but a Book inspired in every part;—not a Book unequally inspired, but all inspired equally;—not a Book generally inspired,—the substance given by the Spirit, but the words left to the option of the writers; but the words of it, as well as the matter of it, all given by GOD. As it is written,—‘Man shall not live by bread alone, but by *every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.*’”

Accordingly, the Preacher admits (p. 126):—

“That a Book cannot (properly) be said to be inspired, or to carry with it the authority of being GOD’s Word, if only *portions* come from Him, and there exists no plain and infallible sign to indicate *which* those portions are; and if the same Writer may give us in one verse of the Bible a revelation from the MOST HIGH, and in the next verse a blunder

\* 2 St. Peter i. 21.

of his own, How can we be certain that the very texts upon which we rest our doctrines and hopes, are not the *uninspired portions*? What can be the meaning or nature of an Inspiration to teach Truth, which does not guarantee its recipient from error?"

Hence, Mr. Burgon observes (p. 74) :—

"Once admit the principle of fallibility into the Inspired Word, and the whole becomes a bruised and rotten reed."

Mr. Burgon strenuously maintains the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration, and refutes certain objections which are brought against it,—particularly the objection that no one can maintain that the words of Scripture are inspired, because no one can tell what the words of Scripture are; and refers to the difference between the *authorship of the work* and the *fate of the copies*. Our space will not allow us to enter into this part of the subject; we therefore proceed to the Preacher's views with respect to *Interpretation*, and it is easy to perceive how the principles of Inspiration which he lays down, necessarily lead him to those of Interpretation. Thus, he observes (p. 163) :

"I boldly declare that the clue to all that has been advanced concerning the marvellous method of Holy Writ, is supplied by the single consideration that the Bible is *the Word of God*,—that Holy Scripture from the Alpha to the Omega of it, is the language of the HOLY GHOST. Incomprehensible and unmanageable on any other hypothesis, all the disclosures of inspired Interpretation, by the hearty reception of this one revealed truth, are rendered perfectly intelligible and clear. The HOLY SPIRIT may surely be assumed competent to interpret what the HOLY SPIRIT has already delivered! His disclosures, therefore, are beyond the

reach of censure, however marvellous they may happen to be. But they are all a hopeless riddle to those who have blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts."

We thus see the principle upon which he answers the question which he asks in p. 148:—

"*Ought Scripture to be interpreted like any other book, or not? That is the real question! Has Scripture only one meaning, or more? That is the point in dispute! Above all, What is the true principle of Scripture Interpretation? That is the only thing we have to discover!*"

The Preacher, in treating of these questions, repeatedly and emphatically denies that Scripture ought to be interpreted like any other book, or that it has only *a single sense*; and he observes (p. 168):—

"If God made this world the particular kind of world which He is found to have made it, in order that it might in due time preach to mankind about Himself, and about His providence:—if He contrived beforehand the germination of seeds, the growth of plants, the analogies of animal life,—all, evidently, in order that they might furnish illustrations of His teaching; and that so, great Nature's self might prove one vast Parable in His Hands;—*why* may not the same God, by His Eternal Spirit, have so overruled the utterance of the human agents whom He employed to write the Bible, that their historical narratives, however little their authors meant or suspected it, should embody the outline of things heavenly; and, while they convey a true picture of actual events, should *also*, after a most mysterious fashion, yield, in the hands of His own informing Spirit, celestial Doctrine also?"

Accordingly Mr. Burgon observes (p. 174):—

"Our purpose has only been to vindicate the profundity,

or rather *the fulness*\* of Holy Writ; and to shew that under the obvious and literal meaning of the words, there lies concealed a more recondite and a profounder sense: call that sense mystical, or spiritual, or Christian, or what you will. Unerringly to elicit that hidden sense is the sublime privilege of inspired writers; and they do it by allusion, by quotation, by the importation of a short phrase, by the adoption of a single word,—to an extent which no one would suspect who had not carefully studied the subject.”

Mr. Burgon afterwards states how that method of theirs is to be applied by ourselves. He then speaks (in p. 157) of the veil upon the face of Moses, signifying mystically the nation’s inability to look stedfastly to the end of the dispensation, and to recognize in the Scriptures the Messiah. And he adds :—

“ Now I gather from all this, and many a hint of the like kind, that the whole of Scripture is of the same marvellous texture, the Old Testament and the New, alike,—whether we have the eyes to see it or not.”

Again (p. 185) :—

“ Under the evident, palpable signification of the words, there lies concealed something grander, and deeper, and broader; high as Heaven,—deep as Hell.”

So again (p. 253) :—

“ The Bible, I repeat, is all severest history from the Alpha to the Omega of it. But then underneath the surface there are meanings high as Heaven, deep as Hell: and why? Because *the true Author of it is not man, but God.*”

\* “ Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem.”—TERTULLIAN *ado. Hermog.*, c. 22.

Again, and lastly (p. 184) :—

“Those who are for eluding the secondary intention of Prophecy, the obviously mystical teaching of Types, the allegorical character of many a sacred narrative,—are no less dangerous enemies of God’s Word than those who frame unworthy theories, in order to dwarf Inspiration to the standard of their own conceptions of its nature and office. I say it is only another way of denying the Inspiration of the Scripture, to deny what is sometimes called its mystical, sometimes its typical, sometimes its allegorical sense.”

We have thus completed our quotations from these remarkable and deeply interesting Sermons. They are destined, we doubt not, to inaugurate a new era in the theological teaching of the University. The Sermons of Mr. Burgon are the first to take the field, upon this subject. He has pre-occupied the ground ; and unless the other champions against the *Essays and Reviews* come forward and fight the battle upon the same ground, they will find themselves perplexed, embarrassed, and thrown into confusion ; and the scene will be presented of theologians going forth to meet the common enemy of Infidelity, and turning their swords against each other. Mr. Burgon has, however, selected their weapons for them, as also the battle-field, and at a most opportune and critical moment. The crisis is one of the profoundest interest to those who are aware of the real importance of the question at issue.

We say this after a mature consideration of the subject. The present contest is not one of mere individual opinions within the Church, it is a contest of the Church itself with itself : of the Church Re-

formed with the Church before it was Reformed. For what were the opinions of the Protestant Church? Bishop Marsh tells us, at the close of the Twelfth Lecture on the *Interpretation of the Bible*, that in the sixteenth century, beside Erasmus, Luther, and Melancthon, we find Camerarius, Osiander, Chemnitz, Calixt, Zwingli, Bucer, Calvin, Beza, Isaac Casaubon, Drusius, Scaliger, all of them advocates of "*a single sense*," which was to be determined by a grammatical investigation of each word. That in the seventeenth century we find J. and L. Capellus, Frederic Spanheim, Louis de Dieu, Pricæus, Lightfoot, Arminius, Grotius, Episcopius, Le Clerc, and other eminent writers, who were again advocates of "*a single sense*" and literal interpretation. There were some few exceptions, as the Bishop admits, but "good sense," he observes, "and good taste gradually restored the Scriptures to *the same mode of interpretation which is applied to classic authors*;" and, with a few exceptions, the same kind of interpretation has continued to prevail.

But if the Protestant Church has advocated only *a single sense* of Scripture, and, in arriving at that sense, has adopted the same mode of Interpretation which has been applied to *classic authors*, what is this but to interpret the Bible as we would any other book; and what more has Mr. Jowett himself professed to do? Why all this outcry, when he is only faithfully carrying out those very principles of Interpretation which were introduced at the Reformation?\*

\* See Horne's *Introduction to the Scriptures*, ii., 207; *Family Bible*, Preface.

If these principles are wrong, the Church should blame itself and not the Professor; nay, has he not a juster reason to blame the Protestant Church for misleading him, than the Church has to blame him for carrying out its own principles?

That this is not a mere contest of individual opinions, may be further seen from the following remarks of Mr. Neale, on the other side of the question, in his *Third Dissertation*, which treats of the *Mystical and Literal Interpretation of the Psalms*, p. 377, where he says that "the Mystical principle of Interpretation is that on which *the great Commentators of primitive and mediæval ages* wrote, and which they would have recognized as their-own;" accordingly he adds, p. 379:—

"If Scripture has not an undercurrent of meaning, double, triple, quadruple, or even yet more manifold, I confess not only that my work is a mere waste of labor, time, and paper, which would comparatively matter little; but it also follows that all primitive and mediæval Commentators, from the first century till the Reformation, have more or less been deceiving the Church of God,—have been substituting their fancies for His immutable verities,—have adopted the system which is alike the offspring and the parent of error,—that their folios have been a hindrance to the cause of truth, and the labors of their lives an insult to the genuine principles of Interpretation."

Again, p. 377:—

"The Mystical Interpretation of Scripture, as every one will allow, is *the distinguishing mark of difference between ancient and modern Commentators*. To the former it was the very life, marrow, essence of God's Word,—the kernel of

which the Literal exposition was the shell,—the jewel to which the outside and verbal signification formed the shrine; by the latter it has almost universally been held in equal contempt and abhorrence; it has been affirmed to be the art of involving everything in uncertainty; to take away all fixedness of meaning; to turn Scripture into a repository of human fancies; to be subversive of all exactitude, and fatal to all truth."

Hear now Dr. Henderson on *The Minor Prophets*, in the General Preface, who is certainly expressing the sentiments of a great part of the Church of England:—

"In no instance has the theory of a *double sense* been permitted to exert its influence on his (Dr. Henderson's) expositions. The author is firmly convinced, that the more this theory is impartially examined, the more it will be found that it goes to unsettle the foundations of Divine Truth, unhinge the mind of the Biblical student, invite the sneer and ridicule of unbelievers, and open the door to the extravagant vagaries of a wild and unbridled imagination. Happily the number of those who adhere to the multiform method of Interpretation is rapidly diminishing; and there cannot be a doubt that in proportion as the principles of sacred hermeneutics come to be more severely studied, and perversions of the Word of God, hereditarily kept up under the specious garb of spirituality and a more profound understanding of Scripture, are discovered and exposed, the necessity of abandoning such slippery and untenable ground will be recognized; and the plain, simple, grammatical, and natural species of interpretation adopted and followed."

Dr. Maitland, chaplain to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, has written in a similar style: also Professor Stewart, of America, in his controversy with



the late Professor Bush. "No such universal rule (for allegorical or mystical interpretation, says Dr. Van Mildert, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 250) is to be found in Scripture. It is nowhere laid down as a maxim, that there is in every part of the Sacred Writings, nor even in the greater part, a hidden spiritual sense besides that which the literal interpretation conveys." Similarly writes Mr. Conybeare in his *Bampton Lectures*, p. 321, though he admits of a double sense to a much greater extent than some others. On the other hand, Mr. Isaac Williams, Mr. Keble, etc., take the opposite side of the question.

It is well for the Catholic Church that Mr. Burgon's *Sermons* on the one side, and the *Essays and Reviews* on the other, have contributed to bring this question to an issue. Theologians ought not to go on with this perpetual see-saw; or how are people to know what to believe? The Church, however, is at present in a transition state; and this under circumstances of great embarrassment: it formerly passed from the uncertainties of Mystical Interpretation into the certainties of Literal Interpretation, which in their turn have led the Church into the uncertainties of Scepticism, in order to avoid which the Church is going back again into the alleged uncertainties of Mystical Interpretation. Is there then no certainty in any mode of Interpretation? No certainty in the doctrine of *Analogy*, in virtue of which natural things signify spiritual? If all thought so, why should any one recommend Mystical or Spiritual Interpretation? This however is clearly what the Literalists imply, viz., that there is no certain doc-

trine of Analogy or Correspondence. It may, indeed, be granted that the Church has never yet been in full possession of that Doctrine ; but it does not follow that in the Doctrine itself there is no certainty, or that it is incapable of supplying a certain and fixed rule of Interpretation. All Sciences, we know, begin from a state of infancy, and do not arrive at maturity at once. It was a long time before Astrology developed itself into Astronomy, and Alchemy into Chemistry. Mystical Interpretation is, in like manner, but the germ of true Spiritual Interpretation, into which it will have to develope itself by the Science of Correspondence.

And does not this Science of Correspondence furnish indications in the present day of growing into an importance it has never yet attained in the Christian Church? It has been regarded indeed hitherto principally in a merely negative form, in the way of answering objections to Christianity, as in the work of Bishop Butler : we have yet to meet it in its positive form as the method of leading with certainty to a knowledge of the Attributes of God, and of the truths of His Holy Word. There is indeed the work of Bishop Browne on *Divine Analogy*, as also other works in connection with it, such as Mr. Mansel's Lectures ; but if that work of Bishop Browne be true, the doctrine of Analogy cannot advance us a single step in the knowledge of God or of His Word, notwithstanding what the Bishop asserts; for although he allows that there is a certainty in the doctrine, yet, according to him, it throws no heavenly light upon heavenly subjects, because it furnishes us only with

the earthly *sign*, not with the *thing signified*. If this be the case, Mr. Burgon's Sermons are null and void ; for we can know only one side of the Analogy, viz., the natural : we know only in part, and that part the merely *natural sign*. We may dignify or sanctify this natural knowledge, if we please, with the name of *spiritual*, because it refers to spiritual things ; but what are the spiritual things to which it refers is unknown, according to Bishop Browne, and incomprehensible. This theory of course makes him the declared enemy of all Mystical Theology. "In this," says he "consists the emptiness and vanity of all *Mystical Theology*, that it is all a fruitless and impracticable attempt in men, to think and speak of God in some degree as He is in Himself ;"\* and therefore, he says, we cannot have two sets of ideas in our minds, the one of the sign, the other of the thing signified ; for the *sign* is the natural idea or notion, *the thing signified* the spiritual ; and of the latter we can form, it is said, no conception. What then is the use of what has been called mystical interpretation—what the use of a spiritual signification, if we cannot arrive at it ? We may believe the Bible to be inspired as containing within it the thoughts of God ; but if we cannot ascend a single step beyond the merely natural or Literal sense, the contest between the Essayists and Reviewers and Mr. Burgon is mere logomachy. It really matters little which side is in the right, or which in the wrong ; the question, in this case, is not one which belongs to this world, and

\* *Divine Analogy*, p. 78, 171.

can be determined only when we pass out of the natural into the spiritual.

Suppose, for instance, we adopt that view of the Scriptures which is advocated by Mr. Isaac Williams ;\*—

“ As Jesus Christ is Himself especially the Word of God, so the written (?) Scriptures are often dignified by appellations which are given even to the Son of God Himself: as if they did also in some sense, if we may so speak, partake of His *Attributes*, being as it were the very breath of His mouth ; so that it is often doubtful which is most signified in the descriptions given, the written Word, or our Lord Himself. From the inanimate letter they pass to the Spirit contained therein : from the inanimate to the animate and intelligent ;—nay, more than this, to that which is Divinely living and intelligent.”

But of what use is this high doctrine of the Inspiration of the Scriptures, or even of the doctrine of Analogy in their Interpretation, if after all, according to Bishop Browne, we must rest satisfied with a belief in the representative only, without seeking to rise above it by substituting an explanation of its ulterior significance or real ground? The question, then, concerning the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures and their Interpretation, is intimately connected with this question concerning Divine Analogy—both of which are in a state woefully unsettled. And may we not here see the reason of the ever-varying interpretations of Prophecy? Take, for instance, the remarks of Mr. Birks upon this very subject :†—

\* *Study of the Gospels*, Preface, p. 9.

† *First Elements of Sacred Prophecy*, p. 250.

“What do we mean by a Literal interpretation? One in which words have the same sense ascribed to them which they usually bear in daily life. Now this is one half of the truth needed for a right interpretation of the Scriptures. The Word of God is a revelation to man. To be useful to men it must be definite and intelligible, and in this sense literal. But it is also a revelation from God. Now to be Divine it must contain higher truth, nobler thoughts, more full and deep conceptions than such as man conveys to his fellow-men. Therefore in employing human language, it must exalt and expand the meaning of the terms which it employs. It belongs to that kingdom of God which eye hath not seen, neither hath it entered into the heart of man. Hence all its messages bear this same character,” etc.

But what, according to Bishop Browne, have we to do with messages of this kind, these higher truths, and nobler thoughts, more full and deep conceptions? If the meaning or thing signified belongs only to that kingdom of heaven which eye hath not seen; if it be represented by signs of such things as it has not entered into the heart of man to conceive, we cannot affix any true signification to those signs by any interpretation,—any signification beyond the *natural* being inconceivable.

It is true the Apostle adds, “*But God hath revealed them to us by His Spirit.*” But what is it that, according to Bishop Browne, the Spirit effects in such a case? He says,\* that it is to “promote,” “guide,” and “assist” the natural operations of human reason; so that, in respect of the real nature of Divine and supernatural beings and things, we are to consider

\* *Divine Analogy*, p. 186.

ourselves as "a scene or chamber of thick darkness, into which there is no admission of the least direct glimpse of celestial light; wherein we are trusting entirely to *natural reason* for all our knowledge;"\* and to suppose that there are "*other imperceptible inlets* for darting some direct but very minute and indistinct degrees of celestial light into the soul of man," independently of the organs of *sensation*, and the faculty of natural reason operating on *worldly ideas and conceptions*, arises from an entire ignorance of the human mind, and is mere delusion!

Now any one disposed to interpret the Bible as he would any other book, would find this theory of human knowledge admirably suited to his purpose. All spiritual knowledge is at once excluded, because we can ascend no higher than the operations of *natural reason* upon the *ideas of the senses*. Such is the real wisdom of this world which explains to us truly, nevertheless, how it is that the world by wisdom knows not God. In vain will Mr. Burgon preach up the spiritual Interpretation of the Scriptures, if after all we can ascend no higher than *natural reason*: in vain will he tell us that the Scriptures will yield to the Christian reader "*celestial doctrine*," if, according to Bishop Browne, the human mind is incapable of receiving the least glimmering of celestial light. "*Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.*" What light? the light that natural reason *gives*, or the light that natural reason *receives*? Surely that which natural reason receives? From what source? Di-

\* *Divine Analogy*, p. 188.

rectly from the Divine Essence? No, but mediately from within through the *internal* reason, which transmits heavenly light to the *external* or *natural* reason and transforms it; and this fully justifies the general language of the Fathers concerning this Light. For this *internal light* is no other than *internal truth*, although to the school of Bishop Browne such a light may be a mere *ignis fatuus*.

Let us hear now what Swedenborg says upon this subject. He saw perfectly well that it was of no use to take such exalted views of Inspiration, if, after all, we had no faculties which were adequate to the reception of spiritual truths. He says plainly, therefore,\* that—"The light which illuminates the understanding is from Heaven, but that which illuminates the sight of the body is in the World. The light from Heaven is from the Lord as a Sun there, and is in its essence the Divine Truth proceeding from the Divine Good of the Lord. . . . That it is *real light* which illuminates minds and constitutes understanding with men, is not known in the World; although *sight* and *light* are attributed by men to the understanding, and although the Lord in the Word is very frequently called *Light*, and thereby is meant that He is seen by faith and its light. . . . It is called *light*, because the light which illuminates the *internal* of man is the Divine Truth proceeding from the Lord; this is the light of Heaven, thus the light by which angels and spirits see, and also by which the man who is illustrated hath *perception* and *intelligence*."

So again, *Arcana Cœlestia*, 3223 :—

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, 10,569, 10,703.

"There are *two* lights whereby man is illuminated, the light of the World, and the light of Heaven. The light of the World is from the Sun, the light of Heaven is from the Lord. The light of the World is for the *natural* or *external* man, thus also for those things which are in him : such things, although they do not appear to appertain to that light, still do appertain to it; for nothing can be comprehended or conceived by the *natural* man, except by such things as exist and appear in the Solar World, and thus except they have somewhat of form from the light and shade therein. All ideas of Time and Space, which are of so much account in the *natural* man that he cannot think without them, appertain also to the light of the World; but the light of Heaven is for the *spiritual* or *internal* man. The *interior* mind of man, where are his intellectual ideas which are called immaterial, is in this light. Man is ignorant of this, although he calls his intellect *sight*, and ascribes *light* to it; the reason is, because so long as he is in worldly or corporeal things, he hath only a perception of such things as appertain to the light of the World, but not of such things as appertain to the light of Heaven. The light of Heaven is from the Lord alone, and the universal Heaven is in that light."

9051. "Man hath an *exterior* understanding and an *interior* understanding. The *exterior* understanding is where the thought is which comes to perception; but the *interior* understanding is where the thought is which doth not come to perception, but still to the perception of the angels. This latter un-



derstanding is what is illustrated by the Lord when man receives faith ; for it is in the light of Heaven ; and in it is the spiritual life of man, which is not so manifest to him in the world, but it is so in the other life, when man becomes an angel amongst the angels in Heaven. In the meanwhile, that life lies concealed *interiorly* in the thought of the *exterior* understanding ; and produces a sanctity and veneration there for the Lord, for love and faith in Him, for the Word, and for all other things of the Church."

It is unquestionable that this language of Swedenborg harmonizes with that of the Fathers : it is unquestionable that it does not harmonize with that of the school of Bishop Browne. The Fathers, it seems, were all enthusiasts : they never properly understood their own Science of Correspondence, or they never would have used such high-swelling, hyperbolical terms concerning the Inspiration and Interpretation of the Scriptures ! " Had\* the supposed Dionysius or the genuine Fathers rightly understood the Doctrine of Divine Analogy, it would have prevented all that affected singularity of style, and all their lofty swelling terms, and enthusiastical reasonings upon them." The doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures, and the rule of right interpretation, would both of them have sunk to their proper level ; and the Bible would have been interpreted as it was at the Reformation, that is to say, as any other book. We should no more hear of those pompous, rhapsodical, inflated notions of Inspiration and Interpretation to which Mr. Burgon has called our attention ! for Di-

\* *Divine Analogy*, p. 467.

vine light is that whereof we cannot have the least direct glimpse,—no, nor indirect either! for the natural mind reflects in its glass only the natural mind! and if nevertheless, as the Scriptures declare, *Dominus illuminatio mea*, yet He so illuminates our minds that they receive not even a glimmering of the light! The darkness is representative of light, and that is enough! In this case we are like Moses in the cave; we see only the back parts, the external opaque signs and representatives of Truth, such as those of the Mosaic Economy; but we know nothing of any illumination they receive from internal truth. The signs are opaque representatives of things we cannot see; they are not like the precious stones of the Ephod, which are made translucent. We may see the veil upon the face of Moses, but to wish to see the light behind the veil, is presumption.

Alas! if this be the case, what shall we say of the devotional appeal to the Divine Light, which follows?—

“In Thee,\* therefore, the True Light, uncreate, co-eternal with the Father, in Thee ‘the Wisdom of the Father,’ *I behold* that Light which ‘remaining in herself maketh all things new,’ that light that came forth at the bidding of God, the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.”

Or take the case of St. Augustin;†—

“Being admonished to return to myself, I entered into my inward self, and beheld with the eye of my soul, above the same eye of my soul, the Light Unchangeable. Not this ordi-

\* *Beginning of Book of Genesis*, p. 80.

† *Ibid.*, p. 78. See also Dr. Wordsworth upon *The Interpretation of the Bible*, p. 70.

nary light, which all flesh may look upon; not such was this light, but other, yea, far other from all these. He that knows the Truth, knows what that Light is, and he that knows It, knows Eternity. Love knoweth it. O Truth, Who art Eternity, and Eternity Who art Love, Thou art my God, to Thee do I sigh night and day!"

Now is this language justifiable, or is it not? Can it be called rational? or is it all "cant and enthusiasm, jargon and nonsense?" I fear, according to the theory of Analogy sanctioned by many theologians, such must be the case. It is true that some mystics have talked of an inward light independent of all reason and excluding it: Bishop Browne, on the other hand, maintains, that as the mind can have no direct or sensitive perception of celestial light, all its light or knowledge is derived from the *natural* or *external* reason operating upon the ideas of sensation and imagination. Was this what our modern divine, or what St. Augustin, was speaking of? The mystics would exclude the *natural* or *external* reason; Bishop Browne would exclude the *spiritual* or *internal* reason, thus even the least glimmering of inward or celestial light. Hence he observes with regard to certain Mystical Divines, that they arrogate to themselves a direct and familiar intercourse with the very nature of God and spiritual things; and such an immediate view of them by an inward light from Heaven in the mind, as renders the use of all sensation and reasoning vain and unnecessary. This was the case, he says, to a much greater extent with the Gnostics. Doubtless serious errors have been committed on this subject; but, on the other hand, Bishop Browne maintains

that we have no other faculties of perceiving or knowing anything Divine or human but our *five senses* and our *Reason*, meaning by Reason only the external reason, though he sometimes dignifies it with the name of *the pure Intellect*.

"Men's endeavoring,"\* says he, "to abstract the intellect from all objects of sense, so as to take a direct view of spiritual things; and working up their minds to an opinion and belief that they have some degree of intuitive direct knowledge of them, though imperfect and obscure, hath proved a fatal delusion, and never served any real and substantial end of religion. I believe I may safely appeal to the experience of the best of men, whether they ever found *any the least glimmerings of such celestial light* in their most exalted contemplations? Many, who never aspired to this immediate and familiar intercourse with heavenly objects, have arrived to great degrees of habitual virtue and holiness; whereas the contrary opinion does but puff men up with spiritual pride, and too often ends in rank enthusiasm."

Such being the case, we ask, What are the operations of the external reason upon these ideas of sensation and imagination whence alone our light is to be derived? They are those, he says, of simple apprehension, comparison, abstraction, composition, transposition, illation, and so forth, whence we acquire in the natural mind a vast number of compounded ideas, simple and complex notions, etc. But all this is mere *secular* knowledge nevertheless! How then is this knowledge made *spiritual*? By any illumination from *within*? No: says he, but by regarding it as the *sign* or *representative* of what is spiritual,

\* *Procedure of the Understanding*, p. 95.

and of which we know nothing beyond the sign in the external natural mind.

Now it is obvious, that if we suppose the existence of an *internal* reason, it has in such a case no assumed communication with the *external*. It is absurd to talk of the external reason being *spiritualized*, merely by making its conceptions the known *signs* of unknown things. The external reason in this case could not furnish the signs: it would be replete with all the fallacies and falses of the natural mind, which have always rejected the truth divested of fallacies. And what is the consequence of there being no communication between the internal and the external reason? The external reason ceasing to be to the internal a medium of communication, thus of external consciousness to the individual, the revelations made to the internal could not be communicated to the world except by itself; and thus the internal reason of one man would have to communicate its knowledge to the internal reason of another; which of course could not be done through the medium of language proper to the external reason, but must be done only by every man having his own distinct revelation. Thus, as Dr. Browne says, even supposing that what he calls the pure Intellect should be capable of receiving some little, obscure, and confused glimmerings of light; still it would be impossible for one man to communicate this revelation to another; and it would require the same Almighty Power after the same manner to enlighten the mind of every individual man, or he could have no sort of idea or conception of it.

Now it is remarkable, that the Mystics in question and the school of Bishop Browne agree in this, that *there is no communication between the internal reason and the external*: the result is, that while the former exclude *external* reason, the school of Bishop Browne excludes the *internal*; and the consequence is, fanaticism on the one side, and naturalism on the other. The advantage of Swedenborg's view of the subject is, that it points out the serious error of both, namely, that of *omission*; on the part of mystical Divines, the omission of external reason; on the part of Bishop Browne's school, the omission of internal reason; for otherwise this internal reason would have supplied to the external the very significations which his system of Analogy fails to supply, and not have left him in the possession of mere empty signs and representatives: it would have shewn to him what positive *truth* there is in the Doctrine of the Trinity, Atone-ment, and Intercession, as conceived by the external reason, enlightened by the internal and thus purified from fallacies: it would have tended to bring the whole external reason into correspondence with the internal; so that the whole external rational mind, including the will and affections, would itself be transformed into an image and likeness of God, perceiving good to be good, and truth to be truth, and evil to be evil, and the false to be false; and this in consequence of an influx from *within* into external knowledge derived from *without*, upon the principle that it is purity of heart which leads to clearness of vision.

•

The external reason would thus be made the me-

dium of discoursing, without fallacy, of heaven and heavenly things, thus of supplying to our consciousness the *signification* as well as the *sign*.

Surely, the very fact that on this subject the language of the Fathers and that of Bishop Browne are so little in harmony, is sufficient to indicate that there is somewhere a very serious difference between the two in respect of *the constitution of the human mind* and the Doctrine of Divine Analogy; and it is perfectly certain, that until this question be settled, there will be no end of controversy on the subject of Inspiration and Interpretation. If the Scriptures be the Word of God, as much so as if they were spoken by God Himself; if they accordingly partake of His Divine Attributes; it is perfectly clear, that the same law of Analogy applies to both cases; and the consequence is, that the Doctrine of Analogy applied by the Fathers to the Interpretation of Scripture, and the Doctrine applied by Bishop Browne to the interpretation of the Attributes of God, must be fairly argued out, and we must be allowed to see on which side the Truth lies. Both cannot be true: the difference, we submit, lies principally in this: the faculties by which a man has a perception of spiritual things are altogether ignored by Bishop Browne, nor does he appear to be even aware of their existence. "Thinking," says he,\* "is by a general mistake attributed to the pure spirit, exclusively of those material organs without which it cannot exert one thought, and in a necessary conjunction with which it performs all its operations:" as such, all our ideas

\* *Procedure of the Understanding*, p. 147.

and conceptions are derived from *without*, and we then make them stand as representatives of spiritual things of which we have no idea or conception—and this is genuine spiritual knowledge! This theory of knowledge of Divine things, however, is amply sufficient, on the ground that our perceptions can never transcend the merely natural region of thought. Dr. Browne has ascended as far as the *external or natural reason* of the human mind, the region of Logic, Metaphysics, and the Sciences: but he has ignored, nay, he has denied, the existence of the *internal reason*, which receives its light not from the external reason, however learnedly full this may be of “compound ideas” or “complex notions;” but from the Divine Logos, through the ministration of angels and spirits attendant upon man. The external reason is thus altogether distinct from the internal, the relation between the two being a relation of correspondence; so that in the spiritual man, the *internal reason* is *within* the *external*, subordinating the external to it: the spiritual *within* the natural, subordinating the natural to it. The natural reason, thus receiving light from the spiritual reason, becomes the outward conscious manifestation of the spiritual; and although there be thus within us two distinct lives, yet they are not discordant. The household of our nature is not divided against itself: those feelings of love, reverence, and gratitude which move us in a lower degree towards human relatives and friends are not thrown aside, are not exchanged for any abnormal state of ecstatic contemplation; for the spiritual man is a rational



man internally and externally. He purifies his external affections, but does not destroy them: he *subordinates* his external reason to his internal, and thus does not repudiate, but perfect it.

This is the normal state of the human mind. How far it may please the Almighty, in *exceptional* cases, to permit, for His own wise purposes, a consciousness of the operations of the internal reason apart from the external, or a simultaneous consciousness of the operations of the external and internal reason, it is not for Kant, or Browne, or any other mortal man to determine. We can judge of the cases only as they are faithfully presented to us, and we must take care that, in coming to a conclusion, our external reason be enlightened by our internal.

If, indeed, we can ascend no higher in the knowledge of spiritual things, than the substitution of *natural ideas* and *conceptions*, as external signs of these things which cannot enter into any region of the mind, why not apply the same principle to the *will*, and say; that we can ascend no higher than *natural affections*; and that all that we mean by having the kingdom of heaven within us, is merely the substitution of these natural affections as the signs or representatives of such as are spiritual but which we do not possess, and of which we can experience nothing, because we never can ascend above the region of mere natural affections? Surely we are thus not Christians, but only representatives of Christians, and sorry ones too! For it is admitted,\* that

\* *Procedure of the Human Understanding*, p. 472, etc.

in this case we come into possession of no new faculty of perception ; that we experience scarcely any alteration of those we already have, since otherwise we must pass through the process of a second creation in an unevangelical sense ; that hence all revelation made to the mind must necessarily come from *without*, not from *within* ; for, in order to see the representatives of spiritual things, we must look *downward* and *outward*, where these representatives are ; that from this *external* source therefore comes all genuine illumination ; and although all this knowledge is only secular, yet inasmuch as it is the representative of what is spiritual, it is therefore spiritual !—a knowledge into which, nevertheless, not one ray of spiritual light can enter from within—no, not the smallest glimmering ! This theory of Analogy furnishes us with a *key to modern Theology*, and with the philosophy of Literal Interpretation. We only point out to Mr. Burgon and his theological school, that as long as this theory prevails, his Lectures on Divine Inspiration and Interpretation will be regarded as mere weapons of straw against the *Essays and Reviews*. Dr. Browne's writings may be forgotten ; but his principles live and flourish.

These very general remarks upon this part of the subject, must suffice for the present ; it may be that the subject will require to be more fully considered on a future occasion. In the meantime we observe, that when Mr. Burgon, in common with other theologians, affirms that the Church has no *theory* of Inspiration, may we venture to suggest, that if he will have the goodness to furnish a clear and distinct

idea of what Divine Inspiration is, there will be no difficulty about the *theory*?

The *real* difficulty lies in establishing a clear, definite, and systematic doctrine of Correspondence. Undoubtedly the Fathers have nowhere done this: one consequence is, that the whole doctrine has never escaped the region of doubt and uncertainty. Many regard it as incapable, from its very nature, of being satisfactorily explored, or of yielding any useful results. The only alternative, therefore, in this case has been found in adopting *a single sense*. This alternative has been one of sheer necessity. The result has been, the necessity also of interpreting Scripture the same as any other book; the Doctrine of its Divine Inspiration, as a matter of course, cannot be maintained, and Scepticism and Infidelity take the place of Christianity. *The absolute need of the Church in the present day is a systematic doctrine of Correspondence*; a doctrine essential to Theology regarded as a Science. To speak of Theology as "the Queen and Mistress of all the Sciences," and to exclude from it the one grand Science, by which natural things are seen to be connected with things spiritual and Divine, earth with heaven, and hence the Church upon earth with the Church in heaven, can result only in leaving Theology without a Church, without a Bible, and without Christianity. The desideratum in Theology, viz., a definite doctrine of Correspondence, Swedenborg has undertaken to supply; and his writings *must*—aye—they will be made the subject of serious enquiry and earnest investigation by all those manly, honest, and good hearts,

who sincerely desire to offer a real assistance to the Church in its present crisis.

One important question, however, still remains.

Can the Preacher maintain the principles of Inspiration and Interpretation which he has maintained, and the Canon as it now stands? We predict he will find that he cannot, or that others at least will do so. Either he must lower his ideas of Inspiration in order to include all the Canonical books, or he must exclude from the Canon certain books in order that it may answer to his ideas of Inspiration. Let Mr. Burgon succeed, as we hope he will, in establishing the general principles he advocates, and immediately a controversy with regard to the Canon will be the result. Mr. Burgon is opposed not merely to the Essayists and Reviewers, but to a large amount of theological teaching in the University of Cambridge: we are only too glad, however, to find that the subject has at last fairly gained the attention of theologians, and that we may now look for many useful and important auxiliaries to the cause of Truth in the Church of England. We can well afford to listen with complacency to the observation (p. 179) that "novelties in religion never can be true"—that "we must ask for the old paths"—that "the faith was once delivered to the saints"—that "there will be no new Deposit"—that "there can be no new Doctrines"—that "there has been no fresh Revelation"—that "no new principle of guidance has been vouchsafed to man"—that "a new method of interpreting Scripture is quite impossible"—all this we may be willing to concede, if Mr. Burgon

concedes, as he does, that his own views of Inspiration and Interpretation are not new. Verily they are, in the main, the same with those of Swedenborg. We will not dispute about the Truth being new or old, so long as it is the Truth, and as such Eternal. The same we may say with regard to Doctrines. If the discovery has been made that Swedenborg's principles of Inspiration and Interpretation are not new, who knows but a similar discovery may await us with regard to his Doctrines? and what does it signify, whether those Doctrines be called new or old, provided they are True?

Before dismissing this part of the subject, we would make an observation with respect to *Progress*. "Philosophia," says the great Bishop Pearson, speaking of Physical Science, "*Philosophia quotidie progressu* ; *Theologia nisi regressu non crescit*." We are not inclined to dispute about terms even here. That Theology has been going in the wrong path Mr. Burgon admits ; and as in this case the best thing it can do is to *retrace* its steps in order to start afresh, we are willing in this sense to admit that it is making *progress*. But if it be affirmed, that, having found the point from which it had mistaken the way, and seeing before it the right road, it ought to refuse to walk in it, through fear of making *progress*,—what shall we say? Will Mr. Burgon relieve us from the dilemma? Will he venture to say in this case—" *Theologia nisi regressu non crescit*," or rather, according to the old adage,—"*Non progredi est regredi*?" In any other sense than the one we have pointed out, the observation of Bishop Pearson is a transparent fallacy ; and

in the sense thus explained—the only sense in which it is free from absurdity—of what use is it to the Lecturer's argument? We, too, would go back with him to the early ages of Christianity, not for the purpose of staying there, but for the purpose of finding the entrance into the right road, and of making progress, not regress in that road,—a road which leads to the New Jerusalem.—“I am the way, the truth, and the life,” saith the Lord. In that way let us walk,—not backward, but forward. It was because all they of Judah\* “went backward, and not forward,” that “the truth was perished and cut off from her mouth.” “Oh, Jerusalem! thou hast forsaken me,” saith the Lord, “thou hast gone backward.” Did the Ark of the Lord, which, we are told, represents, among other things, the Christian Church, in order to reach Zion move backward or forward? or will Mr. Burgon affirm, that it is the great privilege of the Church to go forward, and of Theology to go backward? These remarks we respectfully offer to his notice; and although there are certain points on which we might seriously differ from him, yet they are comparatively subordinate to the one grand question we have been considering; and we cannot conclude this part of the subject, without once more thanking him for his important services in *the renovation of Theology*, and through the medium of Theology, of *the state of the Church*. Our only regret is, that he should have spoken of the Essayists and Reviewers as he has done. We have shewn that they are not

\* Jeremiah vii. 24; xv. 6.

the original parties deserving of blame. The *Essays and Reviews* are only the natural results of the past and present state of Theology, and have been most highly serviceable in bringing the great questions at issue to—a crisis.

We now pass on to an unpretending but yet important work in immediate connection with our present subject, on *The Beginning of the Book of Genesis*, by the Rev. Isaac Williams.

This work is important as recognizing a spiritual sense in the much litigated first chapter of Genesis. Had the respected author acknowledged this spiritual sense to prevail only throughout the Mosaic ritual, or the wanderings of the Israelites in the wilderness, or throughout the Psalms, or occasionally in the prophetic and historical parts of Scripture, this recognition would after all have been only partial, and confined to the particular instances which might be specified. But to apply the principle of Analogy to the first chapter of Genesis is a different thing; because thus the principle is recognized as *universal*, and as extending throughout *the whole visible creation*. "Creation in the Mosaic account becomes thus," says Mr. I. Williams,\* "a most impressive Gospel." . . . "It† is the very purpose of objects in visible Nature to suggest to us the invisible as we contemplate them." . . . "In‡ the creation we behold the Gospel as in a glass darkly. 'For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world

\* *The Beginning of the Book of Genesis, with Notes and Reflections*, p. 19.

† *Ibid.*, p. 64.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 63

are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made.' . . . "There\* are wonderful correspondences in the ways of God ; one thing answers to something else : and as the Wise man says, 'All things are double one against another.' So that the chief manner in which God instructs man both in *Nature* and grace is by *Analogy*." . . . "What† then if in the creation of the Heaven and the Earth we see also that new world, which, though it be on earth, is called the Kingdom of Heaven?"

Assuredly here we have a principle as universally established throughout the works of God as a principle can be ; and why so? Because, as Mr. Williams says, the whole Mosaic "creation‡ of the world was through and for and by Him who is the Incarnate word of God;" . . . "and, therefore, as Augustin says,§ all things that are written, even concerning the creation of the world, may be interpreted as bearing on the signification of things future." . . . Moreover we are told that "the written Word of God in the world|| in some respects serves the same purpose as His presence beheld in the flesh;" if so, does not this give the theory of the union of the Divine and Human elements in the written Word? It¶ is not that the human element is merely the external and dead sign of the Divine, but it is that the Human is itself breathed into, or inspired by the Divine, and the Word of God is thus Divinely Human. This indeed is the privilege claimed by Roman Catholics for their *Church*. They believe the Church

\* *Ibid.*, p. 56. † *Ibid.*, 56. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 9. § *Ibid.*, p. 19.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¶ *Ibid.*, p. 39.



to be a perpetual incarnation of the Divine life ; and hence speak of the Church as "*Divinely human*," and as constituting the presence of Christ with man. But no Church can be inspired in the same sense as the Word of God ; for otherwise it would be the Incarnation of essentially Divine Wisdom, and as such would be the substitute for the Lord Himself. It is in Him and Him only, and never yet in any Church, no, not even in the Church in Heaven, that the Scriptures have been—*fulfilled*.

There is as much difference, therefore, between the Bible and any other book, as there is between the Humanity of our Lord and that of any other man. All that our Lord spoke and acted was Divine, because He spoke and acted from the Divinity within. Now, the thoughts of God are in the Word of God, or else his Word is not an expression of his thoughts. The thoughts of God are Divine Wisdom, and whatever does not contain this Divine Wisdom is not the Word of God. There must be no longer any evasion or equivocation upon this point : this Mr. Burgon and his theological school openly admit. "Any refinement upon this point," says Mr. Eden,\* "any dilution or modification of the doctrine that the document we refer to is *the Word of God*, will weaken our hands, by having first weakened our hearts and convictions."

If then the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures, as the Word of God, consists in the Divine Wisdom which they interiorly contain ; shall we say that part of the Word of God contains this wisdom and part

\* Rev. C. P. Eden's *Sermons*, p. 148.

of it does not? or that all of it is Divinely inspired, and yet that there are parts which contain no Divine Wisdom? These things have been said, and are even now said by a large portion of the professing Church. Men of common sense have come to see, that if what is said to be Divinely inspired contains nothing Divine, then there is no Divine Inspiration, and so far the Scriptures are not the Word of God, and must be interpreted as any other book. Besides;—

If we admit that this Divine Wisdom is contained in some passages of the Bible and not in others, who is to be the judge of what are those in which it is contained, and what are those from which it is excluded? Are we to leave this to the “judgment,” “discretion,” “prudence,” “sober conviction,” “good taste,” and so forth, of the particular commentator? If so, why find fault with those whose sober conviction, judgment, prudence, and good taste interpret the Scriptures as they would any of the classical authors? When Jerome said, *Ubi materia vel turpitudinem habeat vel impossibilitatem, ad altiora transmittimur*, well might a Bampton Lecturer exclaim,\* “The vague and uncritical nature of a Canon, which, proscribing all that might be held unworthy or improbable in the literal sense, left that unworthiness or improbability to be decided upon by the sole pleasure of the expositor, is sufficiently evident.”

But if we are not to rely upon the sole pleasure of the expositor, on whom or on what shall we rely?

Shall we rely on the laws of Divine Analogy as explained by Bishop Browne? He has laid it down

\* *Lectures* by the Rev. J. J. Conybeare, p. 168.

as a maxim, that there can be an Analogy between mind and mind, but not between matter and mind; consequently not between the *material objects* of Creation and heavenly things. Hence, that when objects of the material world are made use of to signify heavenly things, it is only by way of metaphor; that metaphor, however, has no real foundation in the nature of the things compared, and therefore cannot be employed to express any real truth; that it is Analogy only which informs the understanding, while metaphor only affects the imagination. This being the case, it is obvious that the first chapter of Genesis never can be interpreted upon any principles of Analogy; for all the objects there specified are what Bishop Browne refers to "ideas of sensation," and, according to him, there is nothing in the heavenly kingdom to correspond to these objects. Upon this principle the whole of Mr. Williams' work upon Genesis is purely imaginative, inasmuch as he has been applying the principle of Analogy where Analogy does not exist; for the same reason also all those parts of Scripture in which objects of sense are specified, can be susceptible only either of a literal, or a merely figurative or metaphorical interpretation; and what is this but to adopt the very principle complained of, that the Bible must be interpreted as any other book? for, in opposition to any preordained system of allegorical or spiritual correspondences, even Mr. Conybeare\* suggests the simply figurative interpretation, and accordingly observes:—"I cannot therefore but think, that

\* *Bampton Lectures*, p. 319.

we expose ourselves to less danger, both of falling into personal error, and of throwing doubt and discredit upon the sacred text, by regarding those insulated words and expressions, which were of old esteemed the authoritative and definite, though mysterious, indications of higher things, as possessing that value and significance *only*, which may be fairly attached to them, *without departing from the laws of interpretation generally applicable to all written or spoken composition, sacred or profane.*"

Put this in plain language, and what does it mean? It means, that wherever figurative language is employed in the Bible, the Bible is to be interpreted like any other book. But how are we to determine the limits of this figurative language, as distinguished from the mystical or allegorical? Mr. Conybeare says, that the earlier allegorists held the allegorical principle to exist throughout the whole vocabulary of Scripture: this also is the doctrine of Mr. Burgon, Mr. I. Williams, Mr. Neale, and others. They do not admit any mere "Oriental eloquence and poetry" in the place of "preordained allegorical and spiritual correspondency." The former they allow to be generally applicable to all written or spoken composition, sacred or profane, and for this very reason they positively exclude it from Scripture; because any other book may be interpreted literally and figuratively; but the Bible, not being like any other book, has a vocabulary of its own, founded upon "a preordained system of correspondence." Professor Jowett, being one of the "considerate and prudent critics," repudiates the preordained system of Correspondence;

and in so doing, what else has he done than carry out the system recommended even by Mr. Conybeare? while Bishop Browne has furnished a philosophical theory upon which this may be done,—a theory founded upon a positive denial of any real correspondence between material and immaterial things, whence the necessity of a mere metaphorical interpretation of an indefinite portion of Scripture. This denial has now brought matters to a crisis! It is in vain to say, no; or to attempt to evade the momentous question at issue! If the very Inspiration of the Bible is made to consist in the existence of a spiritual sense contained within the literal, on the principle of Correspondence, then, to deny the existence of that Correspondence, is to deny the Divine Inspiration of the Bible. Now, the distinguishing characteristic of the Protestant Church has been this very denial; and therefore well may it be said, that when this essential characteristic of Inspiration is taken away, no one can tell what Divine Inspiration is; and who will be wise enough to say what advantage is gained by increasing the circulation of the Word of God, and at the same time destroying its Life-giving power? No increase in the quantity of Bibles can compensate for destroying their quality.

When, therefore, Mr. Conybeare says, that in order to shew the extreme uncertainty of analogical interpretations, it is only necessary to look to *Collections* or *Dictionaries of Symbolical terms* on which the labors of expositors have from time to time been employed, I may perhaps be entitled to reply, that in order to shew that these symbolical Interpretations

have a basis of Truth, and possess a uniformity that is truly remarkable, it will be necessary only to refer to a work entitled *The Spiritual Exposition of the Apocalypse*, where these mystical or allegorical principles, as advocated by the Fathers, are applied to the interpretation of that book, and at the same time compared with the interpretations of Swedenborg; and I think it will be seen, that no literal or figurative interpretations ever presented to view such remarkable instances of harmony and uniformity. There stands the evidence, and it has not been and cannot be denied. I will say nothing of Mr. Conybeare's statement concerning the vague and indeterminate mysticism of Swedenborg, because I know there is an opposite charge against him, of his being far too definite and systematic.

Shall we deny, however, that fancy and imagination have been largely employed in supplying spurious allegorical or spiritual interpretations? Certainly not: we admit it to the full extent; but if this be used as an argument against spiritual interpretations, what shall be said of literal and figurative, such as those of the Apocalypse? Is it not notorious that they have failed one after another to such an extent, as to bring the whole system of prophetic interpretation into disrepute? and not only so, but that they have disgraced the cause of Christianity by making the Bible inculcate the most cruel and sanguinary principles? What the Church has wanted has been an Interpreter; one who shall comprehend the principle of Correspondence in all its bearings; for it is

well observed that,\*—"What is written by the Spirit of God can only be interpreted by the Spirit of God;" and that† "the things recorded in Scripture are in, and for, and by the Incarnate Word of God, and can be rightly understood only in relation to Him and His kingdom." Therefore, again we say with Mr. Isaac Williams,—

God‡ "sends a prophetic vision which confounds the wisdom of the wise; for none can interpret until there is found a Heaven-sent Joseph or Daniel. He may write in distinct characters, visible to all men, and allowed to be of God; but none can read them except His own inspired Seer. By Moses He may give us an account of things as they occurred, while yet the fuller purport and manifold bearings of them, none but the wise in Christ in after ages can understand. . . The§ heart is enlarged by the contemplation of things in Heaven, and therefore, as filled with that wisdom, walks humbly and carefully upon earth. May not the truth of this be seen even in the inspired St. Paul, the teacher of the Gentile world? And was not this the case with St. Augustin, the great luminary of the Western Church? What marvellous intellect, what ardent affection, what holiness of life combined! And if such should again be found in one person, great may be the advance in the fuller understanding of the written Word; and treasures of wisdom and knowledge therein *even yet* brought to light, such as are hid in Christ."

Humbly and heartily do we respond—Amen! But if this second Augustin should make his appearance, and offer to the Church these newly-discovered treasures of wisdom and knowledge derived from a spi-

\* *Beginning of the Book of Genesis*, p. 9. † *Ibid.*

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

ritual interpretation of the Word of God according to the doctrine of Correspondence, where is the Church, or where the teachers in the Church ready and waiting for the instruction? *No new discoveries* has so long a time been the watchword of the Church, that it has lost even the few which its ancient Commentators had made; and when some again have sought diligently and discovered the gold and silver which were lost, has not the cry of their alarmed brethren too often been,—*No new discoveries?* Rather let us join in the prayer, “So give now unto us that ask, let us that seek find, open the gate unto us that knock, that those secret treasures of Thy wisdom may be discovered to us by Thyself, which our own natural faculties could not of themselves discover!”

FINIS.





# INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION :

BEING AN

ENQUIRY INTO THEIR TRUE PRINCIPLES.

BY THE REV. AUGUSTUS CLISSOLD, M.A.,

FORMERLY OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

No. II.

---

*"Enquiry on these subjects has now become a necessity."—The Letter and the Spirit. Six Sermons preached before the University of Oxford in the discharge of his office of Select Preacher. By Charles P. Chretien, M.A., Rector of Cholderton, Fellow and late Tutor of Oriel.—Preface.*

---

OXFORD :  
HENRY HAMMANS, HIGH STREET.

LONDON :  
WHITTAKER AND CO.

1862.

LONDON  
MITCHELL AND SON, PRINTERS,  
WARDOUR STREET, W.

## INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION.

---

"EVEN if it were found," says a modern writer,\* "that a denial of the *Plenary Inspiration of Scripture* had the effect of leaving us without any fixed standard of belief, I apprehend that this difficulty would not prove that that denial must necessarily be wrong."

"I know of no work," says Mr. Swainson,† "on the subject (of the *Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures*) that I dare place in the hands of a student of theology. I know of none which, even to a young man of ordinary acuteness, does not suggest greater difficulties than it removes."

We are not surprised, therefore, to find this eminently candid and Christian writer addressing the University as follows:‡—

\* *A Brief Examination of Prevalent Opinions on the Inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.* By a Lay Member of the Church of England. With an Introduction by Henry Bristow Wilson, B.D., Vicar of Great Staughton, Bampton Lecturer for 1851; p. 204.

† *The Authority of the New Testament; The Conviction of Righteousness*, etc. Three series of Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge. By C. A. Swainson, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, and Prebendary of Chichester, formerly Fellow and Tutor of Christ's College, Cambridge, and Hulsean Lecturer; p. 130.

‡ *Hulsean Lectures*, p. 107.

“Thus it may be granted to some, even in the present day, to discover and to exhibit more of the secrets of the Christian dispensation. The emergencies of the times are driving our earnest students to examine closely the books of God’s Revelation, to enquire narrowly into the truth of principles which have been held for the last hundred years without controversy, and to seek for the true mode of meeting difficulties on which the Church universal, acting under the free and unrestrained Spirit of God, has not yet come to a formal or unanimous decision ; on which the explanations of our fathers do not satisfy the more thoughtful men of this generation. It may be that some who will soon assemble around these hallowed walls, may be led by the Holy Spirit to such a point on the road of truth that they may see how the country lies, and then be permitted to describe it to us. I cannot but think that God has a good and loving object in view in permitting us to be tried, as tried we are, by the enquirers of the present day. I cannot but think that these things, as all things else, will ‘work together for good to those that love God.’”

It is certainly remarkable, that, while in the one University the alternative should be set before students, of Plenary Inspiration or of positive scepticism,\* we should be told in the other University that no satisfactory work upon Plenary Inspiration had as yet appeared. Why not? Because it could not have appeared without coming into collision with much of modern Theology. It is a fact, as we shall have occasion to see, that various systems of Theology have prevailed irreconcilable with any doctrine of the Plenary Inspiration of by far the larger portion of Scripture; nay, further, irreconcilable with its

\* See Mr. Burgon’s *Sermons*.

Inspiration in any sense. Theology ought certainly to be dependent upon Divine Inspiration; but Divine Inspiration has been made dependent upon Theology. How this has been effected, it will not be difficult to perceive. A Theology has prevailed of which the Epistles are the foundation; the Gospels next in importance; and the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms almost superfluous additions. Let us illustrate the case.

The Law, it is said, was a shadow of good things to come; the Gospel is the substance. You can speak of the inspiration of a substance, not of the inspiration of a shadow. The shadow, the covenant of shadows has passed away; "*In that he hath said a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.*"\*—"We are false to our position, if for a single moment we make the Gospel depend upon the Law. We not unfrequently meet with the expression that the Gospel is founded upon the Law. But such language is neither according to the letter nor the spirit of Holy Scripture."—Certainly not, if to build upon the Law, were to build upon a shadow:—"Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'"—True! but Jesus Christ is *within* the Law. The Law was the outer shadow, which concealed the substance within. The substance was there, but the Jews could not see it. They could see

\* This and other extracts in the sequel in inverted commas, but without reference, are taken from *Sermons* which have been preached before the University; the truly Christian spirit of which must be acknowledged, even while the Theology is rejected.

nothing but shadows which they mistook for the substance.

Shall we say that, to us who are Christians, the whole Five Books of Moses are but a shadow? Nay, not even this; a shadow that was, but that now is not, since it has passed away with the Dispensation. Surely until we come to regard the Law as something more than a shadow, it will be impossible for us to maintain that it is part of the Word of God. A mere shadow that appears for a time and then passes away, has never been an emblem of stability but always of vanity; and can never be the same with the Word of God, or with any part of it. When the Apostle was speaking of the Law as a shadow of good things to come, he was speaking of its externalities, types, and figures; not of the substance, or of the truths they inwardly contain. The old Dispensation has passed away, but the Law has not passed away; and yet because the *Old Covenant* is sometimes used to signify the Old Testament and sometimes the Old Dispensation, the Testament is identified with the Dispensation, and both are equally said to have decayed and vanished away. It is from this school of Theology principally, that has emanated the uncompromising opposition to all *spiritual interpretation* of the Law, the Psalms, and other parts of Scripture. God has now permitted this opposition to come to a crisis! The Church is driven to the alternative, either to admit the spiritual sense of the Old Testament, or to reject its Divine Inspiration. Any one acquainted with the state of Theology will know, that this has been always tacitly the question at issue; so that when

the spiritual sense of the Old Testament has been openly denied, and its Divine Inspiration at the same time nominally acknowledged, such an account has been necessarily given of its Divine Inspiration as to make it simply worthless; for how can *Truth* which is everlasting, and which alone is the Word of God, pass away with the Dispensation? Yet this has long been the Theology of the greater part of the Christian community; and the Sceptic now intervenes to put an end to the rest of the Bible on the same principle as the theologian puts an end to the Law—both are said to be *out of date*. Let us illustrate the case.

“The glory of the Old Testament has waxed faint before the later formation and greater illumination of the New.” . . . —“The volume of the Law which they (the Jews) held in their hands, was luminous while in the darkness; in the light it has itself become dark—a shadow cast backward into the ages, by ‘the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.’”

Another writer, Lord Arthur Hervey,\* observes that we might perhaps illustrate the relation of the whole dispensation of the Spirit under the Old Testament to the dispensation of the Spirit under the New Testament, by the familiar comparison of a chandelier which is to illuminate some spacious hall. Hence he remarks, that—

“At first when the gas is lit, it is supplied in small quantities, and emits but a feeble light. Only the nearest objects are distinguished by it, though it is sufficient for the preparatory

\* *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Five Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge.* By the Rev. Lord Arthur Hervey, M.A., Rector of Ickworth with Horingey. p. 75.



work to be done, and is very different from the darkness which would prevail without it. But when the time is come for preparation to cease, and the real business to commence, then the chandelier is made to emit its full splendor, lighting up every corner of the apartment. So when God would enlighten this dark world with the light of His Holy Spirit, He first gave the dim, and partial, and preparatory light of the Old Testament, but has now given us the full light of the knowledge of His glory, in the face of Jesus Christ."

Is it then the Law, which, after giving a dim and partial twilight, bursts out into the full light of the Gospel, when Christ comes into the world? Decidedly not: the light of the Law, it is said, when viewed in the light of the Gospel, becomes dark. Seen in the dark, it was luminous; but seen in the light, it is only a shadow cast back into the ages. The use of the Old Testament was to emit this twilight; but the twilight being no longer wanted, the twilight and the Testament have both passed away; accordingly the Cambridge Preacher does not hesitate to point out—"the manner of the passing away of the Old Testament."\* Now if the Old Testament has really passed away, is it not merely a waste of time to concern ourselves about its Inspiration? Indeed, says the Oxford Preacher:—

"The Law has EXPIRED after giving birth to the Gospel."

Then there is no longer life in the Law. The Law is dead, and its dead body lies embalmed in the Church. And who now will venture to say that the Law is part of the Word of God? Has the Word

\* *Ibid.*, p. 45.

of God *expired*, or any part of it? How can the dead Law be any part of the living Word? How can that give life which itself is dead? But does not the Apostle say, "If there had been a law given which could have given life, then verily righteousness should have come by the Law?" True: but does the Apostle here mean to say, that the Law could not give life, because there is no life in the Law? If so, "*where the carcase is, there shall the eagles be gathered together.*" They have gathered together, and are devouring the carcase. We may strive to scare away the eagles, but that will not revive the Law. And if the Law be really dead, what is the use of scaring away the eagles? Theologians should never have deprived the Law of its life, the life of its spiritual truth; and a living Law would then of itself have sufficed to keep the eagles at bay.

But if the Law be *dead*, what becomes of the Psalms and the Prophets? for these all derived their life from the Law. Deprive them of the Law, and there is no temple, no worship, no sacrifice, few types or symbols of any kind; for the language of the Psalms and the prophets was founded upon the Law. When a man is employed in bringing a spiritual sense out of any particular passage, he is said to be spiritualizing away the Scripture, and turning the literal facts into nothing. Even were this the case, it would be only a partial nullification of Scripture: the other is wholesale. The Old Testament belongs to the Old Dispensation, it is said, and as a shadow has passed away with the Dispensation. Historical characters may still be serviceable in contributing to

the records of history; such as those of the patriarchs, prophets, priests, and kings of Israel; but of what use is it to record laws, ordinances, rituals, and customs in which no one takes the least interest, and from which no one derives the smallest benefit? Say that the Law is divinely inspired, and deny at the same time that it has any spiritual meaning; and of what use is it to know that, at the consecration of a priest, it was commanded—that,\* *“Thou shalt take of the ram the fat and the rump, and the fat that covereth the inwards, and the caul above the liver, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, and the right shoulder; for it is a ram of consecration?”* Who would consider it worthy of the Spirit of God, or of Divine Inspiration, to give any direction concerning the taking of birds’ nests? *“If† a bird’s nest chance to be before thee in the way, in any tree or on the ground, whether they be young ones or eggs, and the dam sitting upon the young or upon the eggs, thou shalt not take the dam with the young; but thou shalt in any wise let the dam go, and take the young with thee; that thou mayest prolong thy days.”* Who is prepared to say that any spiritual truths lie concealed in these directions? or in the furniture, the taches, and boards, and bars, and pillars, and sockets, and ram’s skins, and badger skins of the tent? Surely the Church takes no interest in these things now; the letter killeth, and the spirit giveth no life, because there is neither spirit nor life. Do not these things belong to by-gone ages? Are not the chosen people dispersed, the temple destroyed, the

\* Exodus xxix. 22.

† Deuteronomy xxii. 6.

sacrifice abolished, the ceremonial gone? Well may we talk of the "*dead Law*," and the "*living Gospel*." Why should we seek the living among the dead? or make the futile attempt of proving the Divine Inspiration of a *dead Law*? Would not the effort be self-contradictory? For how could the Law be God-breathed, and yet be dead? or be inspired with the life of God, and yet be dead notwithstanding? Unless there be living breath inspired, there is no inspiration, and therefore nothing inspired. Who ever heard of the dead breathing, and yet remaining dead—*Deo spirante per Scripturam, et Scriptura ipsum spirante*: while all the time the dead body of the Old Testament lay in the streets of the great city?

But, say the advocates of this theology,—“We believe that Holy Scripture is inspired, when we believe that God’s Holy Spirit has caused it to be written for our instruction in the things of Christ.” But may not every clergyman also trust that God’s Holy Spirit may cause his Sermon to be written for the instruction of his congregation in the things of Christ? would he therefore call his Sermon part of the Word of God, or place it upon a level with any portion of the Scriptures? According to the foregoing account of Inspiration, he would be entitled to do so; nay, more than this, his own Sermon might take the precedence of the Old Testament; for doubtless a living Sermon is better than a dead Law.

We are told that when the Old Testament is introduced in the New, “it is rather claimed as a witness than appealed to as an authority.”

If so, the authority of the Old Testament is gone ; and the New Testament is appealed to in evidence of the fact. Again :—

“The Law and its documents suggest, reflect, anticipate, imply by analogy, but do not contain the Gospel.”

Then what do they contain ? Whatever they contain, if they contain anything, it must be a something whose authority is gone : a something which might bear witness to authority, but which has no claim of itself to be considered an authority.

Upon this view of the character of the Old Testament, a popular system of Theology has been founded ; and reciprocally this Theology has openly advocated the popular views of Inspiration. It is now a question whether or not the days of both are numbered ; whether the Inspiration attributed to the Scriptures, in the sense in which we have been considering it, has any the least title to be called Divine. How can the Word of God die with the Dispensation ? and how can a dead Law be the Word of the living God ? “*Heaven and earth,*” saith the Lord, “*shall pass away ; but My words shall not pass away.*”

But if we shrink from taking the highest view of the Inspiration of the Bible, and are not satisfied with the lowest, cannot we find out something intermediate ? Well then, what must that be which is intermediate ? A something intermediate between the Word of God, and that which is not the Word of God, but inferior to it. This doctrine is the Arianism of Divine Inspiration, and has become very popular. The Arians would call our Lord, personally, the *Word of God* ;

but if you regarded Him as Divine in the strict sense of the term, they would deem you to be as much guilty of idolatry in respect to the personal Word, as others of Bibliolatry in respect to the written Word, if you considered it to be really Divine. There is no Divine Inspiration intermediate between Divine Inspiration and something else.

Do you then, it will be asked, maintain the Divine Inspiration of the Bible in the highest sense? If so, what do you mean by the Divine Inspiration of the record of the abominations, wars, murders, adulteries, cruelties, and curses we read of in the Scriptures? Let us take the objection as stated thus:—"As in the course of our Services we read the Psalms, we often find, following on some touching passage of sorrow or penitence, or mingling even with the voice of love, the burning words of indignation, and the cry for revenge upon enemies. Then, *though our lips proceed, our thoughts pause*. We repeat the words in a strong historical and personal sympathy with the man after God's own heart; and yet we feel that such language, and such thoughts and feelings, *are not those of the Gospel, or ours.*"

Be it so: but the question is, whether, notwithstanding all this, the language is the language of the Word of God. Does the Psalm cease to be part of the Word of God, because of such language? If it does, let us fearlessly acknowledge the fact; and candidly confess that the Psalms are not all divinely inspired: and that neither does Divine Inspiration belong to those parts of Scripture which record the infirmities and iniquities of mankind. For we are

not now speaking of the Inspiration of the *writer*, but of *the thing written*; and if we exclude from Divine Inspiration all those parts of Scripture to which we have referred, *how exceedingly small will be the dimensions to which the Word of God will be reduced!*

Such, in fact, is practically the case in the present day. It is seen that a large portion of the Scriptures, taken in the literal sense and that alone, is *out of date*; and if this be really the case, it is out of the power of any Church to preserve its authority. The heavens, which declare the glory of God, will have measured out the days and the years of the so-called Word of God; and if so, of the Church also which is founded upon it. If any Church will place the wisdom of the Word of God in that literal sense only which refers to Space and Time, the Word of God, like the temporal power of the Pope, must be subject to all the vicissitudes of Space and Time; and if the Word of God—much more will the Church—vanish like the baseless fabric of a vision.

After all, however, this evanescence is only the fate of a Dispensation. We cannot assign to the Word of God only the duration and authority of the Dispensation. There is indeed a real, and a mighty movement going on in the present day. The Church, we are told, is stable: it is the Scriptures which seem to be moving. Has the Church then an authority independent of the Scriptures, on the ground of its having existed before the Scriptures? If it has, can it give that authority to the Scriptures, and save them? If so, now is the time. Or if we suppose the Scriptures to be divinely inspired, and thus to be the

Word of God, are the Scriptures above the Church, or the Church above the Scriptures? Shall the Church save the Scriptures, or the Scriptures the Church? Assuredly, lower the inspiration of the Scriptures, and one of two things must follow;—either the authority of the Church must be proportionably exalted in order to maintain the authority of the Scriptures; or else, ignoring Church authority, the Scriptures must be given up to the sole pleasure of the critic or the expositor—after which—the deluge.

This is now the prospect before us! whatever of order exists, is owing to the organization of religious bodies; not to any agreement as to the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures; not to any reception of any life and light derived from its spiritual sense. That Spiritual sense is denounced;—it stands clothed in sackcloth; but, amid the contumelies of its opponents, has nevertheless been calmly and deliberately performing its solemn duty,—OF—MEASURING THE TEMPLE!

The case, however, does not end here; for we regard, as was said above, the Word of God, read in the public Services of the Church,—“as conveying thoughts and feelings which are *not those of the Gospel, or ours*”—“*though our lips proceed, our thoughts pause.*”

Does this statement really mean to intimate that, as understood in the literal sense, many portions of the Psalms are *not morally fit to be read in a Christian Church*; and that with our lips we utter language in our public worship, not only which *we do not mean*, but which we *repudiate and condemn*? What then



is the alternative of the worshipper?—"We lay them before God in the congregation, and pray Him to put His meaning upon them!"—What meaning?—"A meaning they have in His Providential purpose, though that meaning may not be David's, or our own."—Still, what is the meaning? Let us listen to the answer. "And so we accept the utterances of the Old Testament writers, often not knowing precisely their force or import, (how can we know it when we know not who wrote them, or when, or why?) but *leaving them to God, and waiting for His interpretation.*"\*

Has then no commentator hitherto supplied it? Has the Church been hitherto unable to give any true meaning to the words? After eighteen hundred years is the congregation, or the Church, still looking to God, and waiting for His interpretation? But how can He give it save through an interpreter? Is the Church or congregation waiting for an interpreter?

"Thus from the height of the Gospel we look down upon the Law, and through the Law to the immensities beyond it."

Nay; but to the immensities *within* it. "*Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy Law.*" It is only when we look at the Law from the Gospel, that we know what the Law is. To the Jew it was a shadow of good things to come: to the Christian it is the coming of the substance, though in shadows. When our Lord taught His dis-

\* See a good observation of Lord Arthur Hervey on this subject in our *Appendix*.

ciples, He taught them from out of the Word which He was fulfilling: "*then opened He their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures.*"

... "No wonder that His presence brought out in full relief a thousand deep and hidden meanings which we cannot recall in His absence."

Undoubtedly, if he is absent, we cannot recall them. But where is His Spirit? Is not His Spirit present? and may He not teach us by His Spirit? Why may not His Spirit bring out *a thousand deep and hidden meanings*, especially when He is present by His Spirit?

Nay! but the Church has denied that the thousand deep and hidden meanings are there; and if so, it would surpass even the wisdom of her Saviour or the Power of His Holy Spirit, to bring them out. 'They are not there and never were there,' has been the voice of the larger part of the modern Church.

"From the very dawn of Christianity," says Dr. Lee,\* "some have been found to question the identity (of the Divine Author of the Old and New Testaments); and even to assert that the two portions of the Bible are heterogeneous, and opposed. Of such importance, however, has the exposure of this error been always deemed, that, as I have already pointed out, the Church declares by an express article of the Creed, that it was the Holy Ghost 'Who spake through the prophets.'"

Has then the Church given the interpretation of what the Holy Ghost spake? So far from it, that a

\* *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, by William Lee, D.D., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin; p. 96, *Second Edition*.

virtual denial of the Divine Inspiration of the Old Testament has prevailed in the Church itself.

“The revival in our own day,” says Dr. Lee,\* “of opinions whose tendency, at least, is not dissimilar, may, to a certain extent, be inferred from the absence of any reference to the *Old Testament* in the great majority of modern treatises which allude to the subject of *Inspiration*:—an omission so remarkable, that a reader, unfamiliar with the Bible, might imagine that no Church of old had ever received ‘the oracles of God;’ that no prophet had ever foretold the Advent of the Messiah; that no elaborate ceremonial had ever typified the mysteries of the Kingdom of Christ. The revival of such views with respect to the *Old Testament* is not, however, a matter of mere inference. The opinion has been openly avowed, and eagerly defended, that the *Old Testament* is either totally unconnected with the New—except indeed by chance; or that its importance *has passed away*, and that the Gospel dispensation can tolerate no remnant of the covenant under which the Jewish nation was chosen. It is needless to enquire to what extent we are to look upon such conclusions as the result of a false conception of spiritual religion; or how far they may be traced to certain dogmatic views on points of Christian doctrine: it is more to our purpose to examine whether such sentiments have any foundation; and, if not, to expose their falsehood.”

It is not needless, but, on the contrary, *of the greatest importance*, in our present Tract, to enquire what are the *false conceptions* of spiritual religion, or the *dogmatic views on points of Christian doctrine*, which, so far from being founded on the Divine In-

\* *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, by William Lee, D.D., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin; p. 96, *Second Edition*.

spiration of the Old Testament, have abrogated its authority. We have already referred to the dogmatic views of one class, and that a very large one, of religionists in this country. It is a fact, that both the evangelical solidian and the orthodox moralist have been equally opposed to anything like a *spiritual interpretation* of the Old Testament, and the consequence is that no such interpretation is to be found. The theological school of Bishop Horne and Jones of Nayland, never obtained more than a very partial recognition in the Church of England, and had well nigh sunk into oblivion when the Tractarian school emerged into notice. If then the doctrine of the Divine Inspiration of the Old Testament has extensively ceased to be acknowledged in the Church, is the Church in no wise responsible for the prevalence of Scepticism and Infidelity? For it is in vain to say that Inspiration is of the writer and not of the thing written; inasmuch as, when it is said in the Creed "who spake by the prophets," this would allow the prophets to be inspired, but not what the prophets wrote; and the meaning of this article, it is acknowledged, would thus be evaded.

Happily many in the Church are now beginning to awaken to the fact that the Church has been in error: that the thousand deep and hidden meanings **ARE** in the Old Testament: that the Law is not *dead*, but *alive*. Well has it been said, that—

... "In the historical, the didactic, the prophetic portions of the New Testament alike, we discern the Old Testament, 'the old Law, living again,' as it has been finely remarked, 'in a new and spiritual life;' not embalmed and laid with

reverential care aside in the grave, but arisen from the dead, and alive evermore, like its own Divine Founder.' ”\*

The Law then has not EXPIRED: it is alive for evermore like its own Divine Founder; and if so, the life of the Law is itself Divine.

Here, then, we are led to the subject of the union of the Divine and human elements in Scripture—a union which is thus set before us by Adolphe Monod:—

“We find,”† says he, “the same name given to Jesus Christ and to the Holy Scriptures. Both the one and the other are called *The Word of God*. The one of these Words, Jesus Christ, is the living Word of God, the personal manifestation of His invisible perfections in the bosom of humanity: the other, the Holy Scripture, is the written Word of God, the verbal manifestation of these same invisible perfections given by language. The two Words are for us inseparable: for neither is Jesus Christ revealed to us except by the Scripture, nor is Scripture given to us except to reveal Jesus Christ. Thus Scripture is the written Word of God, as Jesus Christ is the living Word of God. And they who point to the human character of Scripture in order to depreciate its divinity, reason as they do who point to the human characteristics in our Lord, in order to deny to Him the title of God. They should acknowledge that *the Human Nature and the Divine Nature are united in the Person of our Lord, as the Human Word and the Divine Word are united in the Scriptures*. Neither is it more surprising that the

\* Lee on *Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, p. 108; being a remark of Mr. Isaac Williams in the preface to his work on the *Apocalypse*.

† See *The Authority of the New Testament; the Conviction of Righteousness; and the Ministry of Reconciliation*. By C. A. Swainson, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, and Prebendary of Chichester, etc.; p. 145.

Scripture, regarded as the Word of God, carries with it, at the same time, so many traces of humanity, than that Jesus Christ, though God, was yet Man. As to the manner in which the two Natures in the one case, and the two Voices in the other are united, this manner is to us an object of our faith: it is part of that mystery which St. Paul calls the mystery of godliness, and fills our soul with joy and hope."

So likewise Dr. Wordsworth :\*—

"In the written Word of God there is a holy union of human with divine, and we are not able to draw the line, where what is human ends and what is divine begins.

"This union of human with divine in the *Written Word*, bears some resemblance to the greatest Mystery of our faith, the union of Man with God in the INCARNATE WORD. The Inspiration of Scripture may be compared to the Incarnation of Christ. Jesus Christ is Emmanuel, God with us, God manifest in the flesh. The two natures of God and Man are joined together in His one Person. But who would attempt to define the limits where God's nature ends, and where Man's nature begins in the Person of Christ? The union of God and Man in the *Incarnate Word* is a Mystery. So is the union of the Divine element with the human in the written Word. It is a Mystery. In both cases the Mystery baffles all our powers of analysis."

That this principle of Inspiration is to a certain extent true, is admitted by Mr. Isaac Williams :†—

"The written Word of God in the world," says he, "in some respects serves the same purpose as His presence beheld in the flesh" . . . "although the analogy must not be

\* *The Inspiration of the Bible. Five Lectures delivered in Westminster Abbey.* By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., Canon of Westminster, Vicar of Stanford in the Vale.

† *Beginning of the Book of Genesis*, pp. 35, 39.

pressed too far, we may say that in some respects it is like the Incarnate Word, in that it is Divine and yet Human; that such union cannot be understood nor explained; that like our Lord Himself who did not usually assert His Godhead, it does not so much lay claim to what is Divine as in every part implies, breathes, lives, as such."

If, then, it be asked, where in the Person of the *Incarnate Word* 'God's nature ends,' the answer is plain, 'It ends in the human nature:' the Humanity is thus the continent of the Divinity. If it be asked again, where in the *written Word* the Divine element ends; the answer is plain, It ends in the human. The human element is thus the continent of the Divine; and on this ground Swedenborg maintains the Divine inspiration of the *Written Word*. Accordingly, Dr. Sewell\* himself admits that—

"Neither in the written Word, nor in the organic creation of God, is there a single part unmeaning, a single part superfluous, a single part without its use and object, its bearing upon some distant relation, its importance in the general harmony,—not one jot, not one tittle, not one letter." . . . "No instructed Christian can read the first chapters of Genesis, without feeling assured that under those simple statements lie prophecies and mysteries of the creation of the Christian Church."

To the same effect writes Swedenborg :†—

"The Word is Divine; and to all and each of the expressions therein, which are taken from the na-

\* *A Letter on the Inspiration of Holy Scripture*. Addressed to a Student, pp. 83, 104.

† *Arcana Cælestia*, art. 2967, 1—4.

tural world and from the things of sense, there correspond spiritual and celestial divine things; *this and no other being the true ground of the Divine Inspiration of the Word.*" Accordingly, he frequently repeats that it is owing to the spiritual sense that "the Word is divinely inspired, and holy in every syllable."

Swedenborg further observes upon this subject—that:—

"The first chapter of Genesis, in its internal sense, treats of the New Creation of Man, or of his Regeneration in general and of the Most Ancient Church in particular; and this in such a manner, that there is not a single syllable which does not represent and imply somewhat *spiritual*."

"That the Word of the Old Testament contains the mysteries of Heaven; and that all and everything therein regards the Lord, His heaven, the Church, faith, and whatever relates to faith, is inconceivable from the letter; for the letter or literal sense suggests only such things as respect the externals of the Jewish Church; when, nevertheless, there are everywhere contained therein internal things, which do not the least appear in those externals, except in the very few cases which the Lord revealed and unfolded to the Apostles; as that Sacrifices are significative of the Lord; that the land of Canaan and Jerusalem are significative of heaven, on which account we read of the heavenly Canaan and Jerusalem."

"But that all and each particular thing, yea, the most particular, not excepting the smallest jot and tittle, signify and involve spiritual and celestial things,



*is a truth to this day deeply hidden from the Christian world; the consequence is, that little attention is paid to the Old Testament.* This truth, however, might appear plainly from this single circumstance; that the Word being of the Lord and from the Lord, could not possibly have any existence, unless in its inner ground it contained such things as relate to heaven, to the Church, and to faith. For if this be denied, how can it be called the Word of the Lord, or be said to have any life in it? For whence is life, but from such things as have relation to life? Wherefore, whatsoever doth not interiorly regard the Lord, doth not live; nay, whatsoever expression in the Word does not involve Him, or in its measure relate to Him, is not Divine."

"Without such a living principle, the Word as to the letter is dead; for it is with the Word as it is with man, who, as all Christians are taught to believe, consists of two parts, an external and an internal. The external man separated from the internal is the body, which in such a state of separation is dead. But the internal is that which lives, and causes the external to live: the internal man is the soul. Thus the Word as to the letter alone, is like a body without a soul."

Swedenborg here asserts, that in the Church but *little attention is paid to the Old Testament*, and the reason is also assigned, viz., the prevalent *denial of the Spiritual sense*. Shall we then say that there prevails in the Church of England a general denial of the Divine Inspiration of the Old Testament? How can we, it will be replied, when that Inspira-

tion is maintained in this article of the Creed, "Who spake by the Prophets?" But, I answer, if the Divine Inspiration of the Old Testament consists in the *spiritual sense*; where is this spiritual sense to be found? Where is the Commentator who supplies it? I might almost say, where is the Commentator who does not deny it? The Creed gives us a profession of faith, but where is the faith to answer to it? It is useless to assert the Divine Inspiration of that which itself has become useless.

If, however, we interpret the article of the Creed as signifying the Divine Inspiration of the writing; and adopt the principle advocated by Adolphe Monod, that the Human nature and the Divine nature are united in the Person of our Lord, as the Human Word and the Divine Word are united in the Scriptures; such a view of the Divine Inspiration of Scripture would naturally give rise to the same controversies with regard to the written Word, which formerly took place with regard to the Word made flesh: it would raise the question concerning the union of the Divine and Human elements in the written Word. If the Humanity of our Lord was the same with that of any other man, then the human element in the Scripture would be the same with that of any other book. It is of no use to affirm, as is often the case, that the union of the Divine and Human elements in Scripture is a subject above our comprehension, and that as such we must not enquire into it, or hold any theory upon it. However vast the subject may be, it no more prevents our holding a specific doctrine upon it, than the mystery of the Incarnation prevents our

holding a true doctrine of the Incarnation. When heresies arose upon this subject, the Church did not decline to enter into any theory upon it, on the ground that it surpassed our faculties ; but the Church formed a distinct theory—a distinct doctrine upon the subject, known as that of the Hypostatical Union ; and there is no question, that if the union of the Divine and Human elements in Scripture be the same with that which exists in the Word made flesh, the Doctrine which expresses the union in the one case, will express it in the other ; in the one case the Word is made flesh, in the other it is made—writing : it cannot be otherwise if the one be the living Word, the other the written Word.

But what is the nature of this hypostatic union ? What is the theory of the Church upon the subject ? Does the union in any way divinize the human nature ? According to many of the Fathers it does : according to modern theology it does not. You may predicate Divine properties of the Humanity ; but you must not believe the Humanity to be Divine. The same destiny has befallen the Scriptures. You may call the written Word the *Word of God* ; but if you say it is Divine, you would be considered as falling into the same error as if you called the Humanity Divine. What is the consequence ? That when we offer up a worship of words to the Humanity, and call the Humanity that which we do not mean ; so likewise when we speak of the written Word, we may call it the *Word of God*, though we do not believe it to be so. A shower of high sounding epithets falls upon the Bible—sound, and nothing more. Surely we may

say—"This people draweth near the Word of God with their mouth, and with their lips do honor it, but have removed their heart far from it, and their fear toward it is taught by the precept of men."

According to Swedenborg, the Scripture is the Word of God, and its inspiration consists in its spiritual sense. The Church has denied that spiritual sense, and is now paying the penalty. Happily for the Church of England, there are some within it who have discovered the mistake; who find that no doctrine of Plenary Inspiration can be maintained, unless that Inspiration be placed in the *spiritual sense*; and that thus alone can they strike at the root of the evils which have begun to desolate the Church.

Now, if we really believe the language of the Word to be Divine, we are supplied not only with a definite doctrine of Inspiration, but with definite rules of Interpretation, which, in such a case, depend no more upon the sole pleasure of the expositor, than the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ upon the sole pleasure of the believer. Christ is the Wisdom of God; and in so far as the Bible contains the Wisdom of God, it is the Word of God; and all power is given to that Word in heaven and in earth. "As such," says Swedenborg, "the Bible is essentially the Word of the Lord in the heavens;" and being at once in heaven and upon earth, it has the power of bringing down the heavens to the earth, and thus of conjoining angels with men, and men with angels. It is thus, in virtue of the union between the Divine and human elements, that a union is effected between heaven and earth.

How it is that the very letter of the Word is Divinely inspired, and as such must be called Divine, Swedenborg has shewn us in the following extract:—

“‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God: all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men. He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, but the world knew Him not. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father.’ He who understands these words in their interior sense, and at the same time compares them with what is written in *The Doctrine of the New Jerusalem concerning the Sacred Scripture*, as also with some things in *The Doctrine of the New Jerusalem concerning the Lord*, may see, that the Divine Truth itself in the Word which was formerly in this world, which likewise is in our Word at this day, is meant by the Word which was in the beginning with God, and which was God: not the Word regarded merely as to the words and letters of the languages in which it is written, but as seen in its essence and life, which is from *within* in the senses or meaning of its words and letters. From this life does the Word vivify the affections of that man’s will who reads it devoutly; and from the *light* of its life it *illuminates the thoughts* of his understanding; therefore it is said in John, ‘In Him (the Word) was life, and the life was the light of men.’ This constitutes the Word; because the Word is from the Lord, and concerning the Lord, and thus the Lord. All

thought, speech, and writing derives its essence and life from Him who thinks, speaks, and writes; the man with all that he is, being therein; but in the Word, the Lord alone is. No one, however, feels and perceives the Divine life in the Word but he who is in the spiritual affection of truth when he reads it; for he is in conjunction with the Lord through the Word; there being something intimately affecting the heart and spirit, which flows with light into the understanding and bears witness.”\*

What this *something* is we shall see in the sequel: in the meantime we observe, that here we are plainly told what is the true doctrine of Inspiration, and what the method of Interpretation depending upon it. This doctrine is thus inculcated: “*In Him (the Word) was life, and the life was the light of men.*” This life and light constitute the Word; because the Word is from the Lord, concerning the Lord, and is the Lord. Not the paper, ink, and type; but the letter, or literal sense of the written Word as it exists in the mind, and contains within it the spiritual sense; for that spiritual sense being from the Lord is inmosty Divine, and is the Lord; whence the letter or literal sense also, as containing within it this inmost sense, is, for this reason, itself Divinely inspired; and is from the Lord. In like manner, when we read the works of Aristotle, Plato, Cicero, or any other author; so far as these works represent to us faithfully their thoughts, we may regard these thoughts as the very mind itself of these authors, hence as the authors themselves; so that in reading their works we say that we have

\* *The Apocalypse Revealed*: art. 200.

been reading the authors; for we are thus brought into communion with their minds, as truly as if we communed with them personally.

Seeing, then, what is the true doctrine of the Divine Inspiration of the Bible; what, now, is the method of Interpretation founded upon this view of Inspiration? Let us consider the subject practically; but in so doing is there any subject so practical as that of *Life*? Let us then treat of spiritual *interpretation* in relation to spiritual *life*; and spiritual *life* reciprocally in relation to spiritual *interpretation*; for it is said, "*In Him was LIFE, and the life was the LIGHT of men.*"

What then are the laws of spiritual *interpretation*, or are there any? This gives rise to the question, What are the laws of spiritual *life*, or are there any?

... "I wish to consider," says Mr. Farrar,\* "the theory of the *religious life*, whether it is subject to laws; if so, whether we can discover them, and in that case what the method is of such enquiry, and what the chief results to which it conducts us. When we ask whether the religious life is subject to laws, the answer is so natural that the analogy of the whole of God's government, both *moral* and *material*, would suggest the presumption that the *spiritual* also must be directed according to a system of laws, either discoverable or inscrutable, that it might excite surprise why we should think it necessary to ask the question."

Great surprise, certainly: but why, nevertheless, is

\* *Science in Theology*; Sermons preached in St. Mary's, Oxford, before the University; by Adam S. Farrar, M.A., F.G.S., F.R.A.S., Michel Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, late one of the Select Preachers to the University, and Preacher to the Chapel Royal, Whitehall. p. 210, *et seq.*

it necessary to ask the question? One reason is, observes Mr. Farrar,—“There have been Christian thinkers who have said, that the whole of the *life spiritual* is subject to merely *moral* laws, and have resolved the Christian life into the ordinary processes unfolded by *moral* psychology. This view is not common in the present age; the whole tone of thought, philosophical as well as religious, has become averse to it; but in the last century it was quite a prevalent one.”—Is not this statement sufficient to account for the repudiation, during the last century, of any interpretations of Scripture having reference solely to the spiritual life? for if the last century proceeded upon the principle that the *spiritual* life was only another name for the *moral* life; and that, as distinguished from the moral life, it was fancy and speculation, of course spiritual interpretation would share the same fate as spiritual life, and merely literal interpretation and moral life would go hand in hand, to the exclusion of everything higher, as heterodox. Here then we see the case in which the *life* determines the *interpretation*; an external life demanding only an external interpretation. But we are now told, that *in the present century the whole tone of thought is become averse to it: the present age wants something more, and something better.* A change, it seems, has come over the religious world! the discovery has been made that many of the writers of the last century, not excluding the great Bishop Butler himself and his disciples, “evinced no perception of the distinctness between merely *moral* life heightened and purified in its aims, and the *deeper, secret, mystical life* which Christians



may possess.”—This indeed is a discovery! and announces a marvellous change! but the observation is just.

What, however, is this *secret*, *deeper*, and *mystical* life, which the last century ignored? Has it any laws? or are they mysterious states which come and go, no one knows either whence or whither? There has been, observes Mr. Farrar, a very prevalent opinion—“that the religious life is a thing so mysterious, so regulated by processes incomprehensible to us, that it exists without our being conscious of it; that it is a thing which we cannot express in words, cannot think of in thoughts; that it is known to God, unknown to man; not detectable in ourselves or in others. This view has been held, in whole or in part, by many persons of different schools. It is one of the greatest of the many defects in the theology created by the Genevese reformer, Calvin. His teaching had led his followers to insist that the divine life is something depending on God’s election, and not on man’s freedom; that its implantation in man is a mystery; that it still exists within a man, not only when he is not conscious of it, but even—(extravagant and inferior minds have implied this)—when he falls into actual sin. Nor is it merely among the Calvinistic Protestants that this doctrine appears. It arises also from the sacramental theory of the Church of Rome. Wherever a writer is found representing that a seed of grace has been implanted, *opere operato*, in the sacrament of baptism, which continues to exist in a man, unextinguished through years of actual sin, we have here under another form the same idea, viz., that the *life*

*spiritual* is something disconnected from *fact*, disconnected from *consciousness*, disobedient to the law that religion must exclude sin; we meet here again, under another form, the notion we have just been combating in the theology of Calvin."

There is moreover a class of Mystics, says the same writer, in whose theology prevails the same idea as in Calvinistic and Catholic theology; and who from time to time assert, against the materialism of the last century, the existence in man of faculties transcending consciousness.

"According to this theory there is a certain faculty in men, an intuition, which rises above all sensible objects, and penetrates into their very essence. It sees the Infinite, the Absolute, not under the ordinary limitations which sense and thought put upon the idea; but, transcending all such bounds, it scans the universe of being, it mounts to the throne of the Eternal, and sees by a supernatural intuition absolute truth, absolute goodness, absolute beauty. The life spiritual is connected with such a power. In one sense this identification may be regarded as making it amenable to laws; but in another the idea of law is thrown aside in the contemplation of it. For *law* is a term applicable to subordinate forms of existence and of knowledge; but inapplicable to a form of existence and of cognition which transcends the bounds of ordinary conscious criticism.

"We have thus presented in opposition the two views of the life spiritual; the one which would make it simply *natural*, the other *supernatural*. And may we not say that there is a grain of truth in both views? *Spiritual knowledge* is verily an apperception of truth which is not cognizable by ordinary faculties; and *spiritual life* is a form of existence transcending even the highest moral life. Not all truth is

to be reduced to that which is amenable to critical investigation. There is a world of life and of thought of which we detect the traces, but cannot understand the nature. And thus far accordingly the *spiritual life*, be it regarded as intellectual or emotional, is *supernatural*; but we must be careful, on the other hand, not to disconnect the spiritual life from the human mind, nor to isolate it entirely from the ordinary facts of mental and emotional science."

So much for this important statement.

Now let any one take these different classes of religionists, who formed by far the greater part of the religious world during the last century, and ask by what possibility they could have welcomed any interpreter who should give a genuine *spiritual* interpretation of Scripture? The *moral* theologians of Bishop Butler's School could not; because there was among them (as is admitted) no distinct recognition of a life, *deeper, more hidden*, kindled by the direct operation of God's Spirit in man's heart; a life consisting, as we are told, in an actual union of the human spirit with the Divine. Calvinistic Theologians could not; for what was the spiritual life they recognized? A life founded upon the principle of Divine election, hence of God's sovereign *power*. How could religionists of this class consistently welcome any spiritual interpretation of Scripture? For the spiritual sense of Scripture proceeds from the Wisdom of God; but in the Calvinistic school salvation proceeds from the Power of God, and Power is made to supersede Wisdom, at least in theory. A spiritual life founded upon the idea of Sovereign *Power* employed in effecting personal election, is a very different thing from a

spiritual life generated and nourished by the truths of Divine *Wisdom*; and indeed one who owed his spiritual life to arbitrary *power*, would regard a spiritual interpretation of the Word of God as needless; and the spiritual sense of Scripture being thus dispensed with, the doctrine of its Divine Inspiration, except in the case of the Epistles, would become a subject of very subordinate importance.

But could Catholics themselves consistently recognize a spiritual sense which taught the laws of the Regenerate life? Certainly not: for if we take the Sacramental theory of Regeneration by baptism, which is not peculiar to the Church of Rome, and which implies the implantation of a seed of grace *opere operato*, we here find implanted a spiritual life altogether *inscrutable*, and transcending all "the cognitions of consciousness;" so that any spiritual sense of Scripture relating to it, would itself also as necessarily transcend our consciousness as the work of Regeneration. The consequence is, that the work of Regeneration would have no relation to any known spiritual sense of Scripture, nor any spiritual sense of Scripture to it; so that in this respect any spiritual interpretation would be altogether discarded, and together with it the doctrine of Divine Inspiration itself, in so far as any interpreter maintained that the laws of the regenerate life were the subjects of its Divine contents.

As to the intuition of the Absolute, I say nothing; because it is a doctrine not pretending to be connected with any spiritual interpretation of Scripture; and even if it were, the spiritual interpretation relating

to it would as much transcend our faculties as the intuition itself: to say nothing of the absurdity of pretended intuitions of this kind.

It is indeed objected, that the nature and laws of Regeneration must nevertheless necessarily transcend our consciousness, because it is said, "*the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.*" But do the nature and laws of the Regenerate life so entirely transcend our consciousness, that even the Spirit of God cannot reveal them? If so, whence are we to obtain any knowledge whatever upon the subject? Shall we say, as it has been said,—'From the lives and thoughts of saints in the Bible, and from religious memoirs in general?'—No! but from the life and the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ, who is himself the Alpha and the Omega of the Bible. In the former case, we need no *spiritual* interpretation of the Bible: in the latter case, we can have no knowledge of the regenerate life without it: the former opinion might be held in connection with pious meditations upon Scripture, but still without any definite doctrine of Inspiration or Interpretation: the latter could not, but must imply the highest and most definite views of both.

Now the present century, we are told, is dissatisfied with a merely *moral* theology, and equally so with the theology of a spiritual life which *transcends all consciousness*. Many in the Church are looking for something higher than the *moral*, even though the moral be that of Bishop Butler; and yet not so high

but that it shall be within the region of distinct consciousness. This is the theology, then, of which we are about to treat: that which relates to a *spiritual life subject to laws*, which are at the same time laws of human thought, and which are supplied by the spiritual interpretation of Scripture.

As then the *religious life* thus considered, is the life spiritual in the life natural, or in other words, the supernatural life within the natural, so that the natural is the living representative of the supernatural; it follows, that the life supernatural, mystical, spiritual, call it what you will, is for this reason subject to laws; and if subject to laws, and at the same time derived from the *spiritual sense* of Scripture, the spiritual sense of Scripture must also itself be subject to laws of the same kind. If the spiritual sense be fanciful, the spiritual life will be visionary, and both will be spurious. If the spiritual sense be true, *i. e.*, communicating true knowledge, the life will be genuine; for "*this is life eternal, to know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*;" accordingly the interpretation which reveals this knowledge will be from God. Thus in the Scripture will the deepest mysteries of the human mind, *viz.*, those of the *spiritual life*, be laid open according to fixed and immutable laws: both as regards the interpretation, and the life that is founded upon it; these laws having a relation to the will and understanding, and being those of *goodness* and *truth*.

Thus we see how the *life* spiritual is immediately connected with *light*; for the truths of the spiritual sense of Scripture are themselves that *light*. Hence

the office of interpreter or of a steward of the oracles of God, is to communicate this light from the Lord through the medium of the Scriptures: but who can discharge this office unless it be one who is himself enlightened? For how can any one shew to others what has never been shewn to him? He himself then must first be the subject of illumination or illustration. Hence no prophecy is of private interpretation. "*Do not\* interpretations belong to God?*" Is not this as true now as it was in the time of Joseph?—"If the Holy Spirit spake in the Scriptures," says Dr. Sewell,† "no one can comprehend His voice, but the same Holy Spirit; no one, but the same Holy Spirit within our hearts can enable us to understand it."—"What is written by the Spirit of God," says Mr. Isaac Williams, "can only be interpreted by the Spirit of God."—Let us proceed upon this principle.

"The literal meaning," says Mr. Isaac Williams,‡ "for the most part, is as the body, the spiritual meaning as the soul; as the soul is united with the body, so must the literal and spiritual meaning be held together; both are necessary for the life of the Written Word. And though the latter be considered usually as the latent and interior sense, yet it is often so obvious and Scriptural, that it speaks, as it were visibly through the letter, *illuminates* it and gives it its character."

And this is the illumination to which the same author elsewhere refers when he says, that, "Even

\* Genesis, chap. xl. 8.

† *Letter on the Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, p. 75.

‡ *Beginning of the Book of Genesis*, p. 75, 32.

to good men in the Church there is an *illumination* of the Spirit of God beyond the written revelation"—beyond, that is, above and *within*.

The spiritual sense then being *within* the literal, as the soul is *within* the body, it is *within* that we must look for the Divine light: and it is at this point, that branch off the two roads that lead to two different kinds of interpretation. By the one class it is said,—“Our providential position, with regard to the Scriptures of the *Old Testament*, taken by themselves, is marked and peculiar. We view them from *without*, and not from *within*. They belong to a Dispensation which has passed away.”—But even the Jews, when they were under that Dispensation, never viewed them from *within*, but always from *without*; for the very reason that they were under an external Dispensation, and therefore did no other than view them externally. Surely, if we would explain the laws of Nature, we must study the order of Nature; and if we would explain the laws of Scriptural interpretation, we must study the order of Revelation, hence also of Divine Inspiration. It is of the first importance that an interpreter should know how to begin.

“All Scripture is written,” it has been well said,\* “not from *without*, but from *within*; the Word going forth from the bosom of God; the inward mystery as it were first conceived, revealing and developing itself in outward expression, creations, events, and circumstances; the spiritual sense sometimes lying under the literal, so that the things themselves described serve to convey it in the way of imagery or metaphor; sometimes being one with the literal, so that the

\* *Beginning of the Book of Genesis*, p. 195.



latter can only be spiritually understood, as in some figurative language of the prophets; or, indeed, they may both together make one whole, branching forth one from the other, yet retaining similitudes. But oftentimes the literal, without the spiritual meaning, may be as *a body without life*; the Spirit of Christ gives life to the written Word, and is inseparable from every part."

This grand truth then, let us bear in mind; that all Scripture is written from *within* to *without*; and we shall then understand the narrative in the Book of Exodus, chap. xxxiii. 8—10, in which the cloudy pillar is represented as removing to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation: and Moses enters into the tabernacle, and from *within* communes with the cloudy pillar, while the people, each standing at the door of his tent, see it from *without*. "Here we behold," says Swedenborg,\* "a representation of the act of looking at the Scriptures from *within* and from *without*." Moses accordingly, who looks from *within*, is spoken of as seeing God face to face, or seeing the glory *within* the cloud; while those who look from *without*, see only the cloud which conceals the glory. "It may be expedient," observes Swedenborg upon this subject, "to say what it is to see from *without* and what to perceive from *within*. They who are in *illustration* when they read the Word, see it from *within*; for their internal is open, and the internal, when open, is in the light of heaven. This light flows into man from his internal and enlightens him, although man is ignorant of it. The reason why he is ignorant of it, is, because that light flows into the

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, 10,551.

*knowledges which are in man's memory*, and those knowledges are in natural light; and whereas man *thinks from those knowledges as from himself*, he cannot apperceive the influx. Nevertheless he may know from various proofs, that he was in a state of illustration."

For the ideas of the interior thought are spiritual, and flow down thence into the ideas of exterior thought which are natural; the region of exterior thought being the region of consciousness. It does not follow that the *light* is not there, because we are not externally conscious of it as light; for if the light were not *within*, it would be absurd to talk of a state of *illumination* produced by that light, unless the expression were used in a metaphorical sense, and implied no corresponding reality. Neither, in like manner, does it follow that the influx does not exist, because we may not be directly conscious of it; the reason of which Swedenborg has above pointed out.

We are not conscious of the influx of the Holy Spirit into our minds; and yet, if we are Christians, we may be sure it is there. Moses, when he descended with the two tables from the mount, *wist not that the skin of his face shone*; and yet it shone nevertheless; and if he placed a veil over his face, it was only to indicate that it was a light which the Jews could not perceive, because of their sensuous and worldly affections.

Nay further than this; even Christians in general have no sensitive perception of the existence of this light. It may, indeed, literally illuminate their minds, while yet external ideas derived from the

light of the world may be comparatively so much more vivid, that the fainter and more obscure impression is unnoticed. While on the other hand, where the spiritual truth is much more vividly impressed than the external representation (a circumstance which happens of course in only *exceptional* cases), there may be a direct consciousness of the existence of an internal light reflected in the external thought.

This may be illustrated by the circumstances which attended the Urim and Thummim. The precious stones, it is well known, represented Divine truths, viz., those of the Word. When consulted, they gave out *light*, or became explendescent. "A like explendescence," says Swedenborg,\* "is also presented inwardly with those who are in truths derived from good; which dictates, and, as it were, gives responses, when truth is enquired after from affection of heart, and is loved as good. That there is such an explendescence, whereby Divine Truth from heaven is revealed in the natural man with those who are illustrated from the Word, is not perceived in the world; by reason that it is unknown that any *light* from heaven illustrates the intellectual principle of man. But that it is so, it hath been granted me to perceive; and also to see."

Upon such a principle we may understand these words of Mr. Isaac Williams.† "And God saw the light, that it was good."

"But what is this light which is thus declared good? It

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, 9905.

† *Beginning of the Book of Genesis*, p. 84.

is not a light of the sun, as it was not yet created. What is it to us to whom by the voice of God it is declared good? Whatever else it may be, it must be a sign and token of some marvellous light other than what we now behold; some *illumination of the mind* and of spiritual eyes within, by which we shall be enabled to see God the true light."

Will you accept this view of the subject? Or will you maintain that of Bishop Browne?\* and say—

"That we have no capacities for any idea of the real nature of this light in the least degree, no more than a man born blind hath any idea of the sun or of light. Such a man of *no more than four senses* could not be said to have only an imperfect, glimmering, uncertain view of things, but *no view at all*: LIGHT would be to him as thick darkness: the sun, and moon, and stars, the firmament, and all the heavenly bodies, would be to him as imperceptible by any idea of them, as if they had no being: the word *light* would be to this man a term to which he could affix no direct idea or conception."

The Bishop speaks out! Let those who are opposed to the principles we are now advocating, speak out in the same candid manner. The Bishop denies the real existence of any Divine Light whatever as Divine light: he declares all *light* to mean simply knowledge derived from the operations of natural reason upon the ideas and conceptions of the external mind: he therefore regards the expression *Divine light* as properly metaphorical; and this on the ground that there can be no true analogy between material and immaterial things; the result of which is, the exclusion from Divine Inspiration of the greater part

\* *Divine Analogy*, p. 20.

of the Old Testament, and a great part of the New : not to mention the impossibility of going beyond the mere representative, or of giving any interpretation of the doctrines of the Atonement, Intercession, or Trinity. Dr. Browne, therefore, looked from *without* to *within* ; and thus, like the people before the tabernacle of the congregation, he saw nothing *within* but only *without* ; he looked out on the cloud of glory from *his own* tent, not from the tent of the assembly. The result was, he could see nothing but a cloud ; but inasmuch as he saw the cloud plainly, so that it ceased to be mysterious, he would not acknowledge the existence of any mystery ; and as to any Divine light *within* the cloud, this light was purely metaphorical. *Light* was the figure, the *cloud* the reality—there was no real light, but there was a real cloud. As, then, it was plain that a *cloud* was a *cloud* and nothing else, at least to us, this, he thought, was clear, solid, practical knowledge ; and that with this we ought to be satisfied, as we have no faculties to go farther : all which indeed is very true, so long as a man looks out from the door of *his own* tent ; in other words, so long as he looks from *without* and not from *within*.

The order, then, of Interpretation is the same with that of Creation, Inspiration, and Revelation, viz. : from *within* to *without*. It is not the outward that enables us to understand the inward ; but the inward that enables us to understand the outward.

We therefore proceed to examine what that *inward light* is of which we have spoken ; and how it is, that, being supernatural, it exists in the natural. This is

the more important, because this *internal light* is appealed to as *the evidence of the interpretation*; and we must be careful that it should not be an *ignis fatuus*, but that genuine light from the Lord which has a direct relation to *life*. Doubtless the influences of the Holy Spirit are frequently spoken of in a vague and indeterminate manner, and but few have any clear and distinct idea of what is meant by them. We propose, therefore, to furnish a very clear and distinct idea upon this subject, as derived from the writings of Swedenborg.

We are, then, speaking of a *real light* flowing into the mind: how do we know that such a light is genuine?

“To those who are in *illustration*,” says Swedenborg,\* “the Lord gives to understand what they believe; and they are *illustrated*, when they read the Word and understand it, who acknowledge the Lord and love to live according to His precepts; but not they who say they believe and do not live accordingly. For the Lord flows in into the *life* of man, and thence into *faith*; but not into faith separate from life.”

It is important, therefore, to remember, that this *internal light* does not flow into a man's *knowledge* of the truth as he reads the Word, but into his *love* of the truth. Now to love the truth is to will it and to do it, hence to live according to it; whence it becomes literally the light of his life.

On this subject the following passage is to our purpose:—

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, 10,659.

"We\* may here then consider to our infinite comfort, that in Holy Scripture, *light* is so often synonymous with *love*; so that the Disciple of divine love dwells on both alike: both pervade all he writes in his Gospel and in his Epistles: the beginning and end of all is both light and love. 'He that loveth abideth in the light.' If we are to come to the light, yet that light is love; and if at the last when we go hence, we are (oh! awful truth) to be manifested in the light, yet unspeakable is the consolation that light is love. For what is *illumination* but union with God? We are made, O! Lord, in Thy love, for Thy love, and in order that we may love Thee."

Now what is it to love God, but to keep His commandments; or in other words, to obey His laws, or do the truths of His Word? Even the most spiritual or internal truths are merely external, so long as they remain only in the external memory, and are not implanted in the will; for it is from the will that the intellectual principle of a man is formed. "The intellectual principle† is in no case opened," says Swedenborg, "except when man perceives and loves truths, and the perception and love of *truth* is from *good*. Hence it is, that truths from good are what constitute the intellectual principle. He who believes that he hath an intellectual principle, who can reason dexterously against the truths of the Church, is very greatly deceived; for he sees nothing *within* himself but *without* himself: to see *within* himself is from heaven: to see *without* himself is from the world; and he who sees only from the

\* *Beginning of the Book of Genesis*, p. 86. By the Rev. Isaac Williams.

† *Arcana Cœlestia*, 10,676.

world, sees from an infatuated lumen, which becomes mere thick darkness, when light from heaven flows into it."

It is only from *good*, therefore, that a genuine perception of truth is derived; and for this *good* nothing can be a substitute, not even the authority of the Church: for to see from this authority, is to see from *without*, not to perceive from *within*: the following therefore is worthy of our attention:—

"Neither\* can truth be conjoined to the good which flows in through the internal man, and which is Divine in its origin, until truth is truth in will and act. This is the *good* of truth. For the good which flows in through the internal man and is Divine in its origin, flows in into the *will*, and there meets the good of truth which was insinuated through the external man."

The principle here inculcated is stated more at large in the following remarks;—

"By† interior truths," says Swedenborg, (viz., those which constitute the spiritual sense of Scripture,) "are meant those truths which are made truths of man's life and affection, thus which appertain to him inwardly; but not the truths which are only in the memory and are not made truths of life; for these truths are called external truths respectively, since they are not inscribed on the life, but only on the memory; for they reside in the external man and not in the internal. The truths of faith which are inscribed on the life, are in the *will*; and those things which are in the *will*, are in the *internal man* ;

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, 4337.

† *Ibid.*, 10,199.



for it is by the truths of faith that the internal man is opened, and that communication is effected with the Heavens. Hence it is evident, that the interior truths appertaining to man are those which are derived from the *good* of love and charity. . . . Whether we speak of the *will*, or of the *love*, it is the same thing; for what is of man's will is of his love. Wherefore truths inscribed on the life, which are called interior truths, are those which are inscribed on the love; thus which are inscribed on the will, from which they afterwards proceed when they come into speech and into act; for *Heaven*, in which the internal man is who is opened, *doth not flow in immediately into truth*, but *mediately* by the *good of love*. But Heaven cannot enter into man when the internal man is closed, since there is not any *good* of love there which receives. Wherefore, with those with whom the internal man is not opened by truths received from the good of love and charity, Hell flows in with falses derived from evil; howsoever the truths of faith, even the interior truths, may reside solely in the external man, that is, in the memory." Moreover;—

"Inasmuch\* as the light of truth with man is altogether according to the state of his love, so, in proportion as his love is kindled, in the same proportion the truth shines brightly; for the good of love is *the vital fire itself*, and the truth of faith is *the intellectual light itself*, which is intelligence and wisdom. Those two principles proceed by like degrees. By *intelligence* and *wisdom* is not meant the

\* *Arcana Coelestia*, 10,201.

faculty of thinking and of reasoning on any subject ; for this is given alike with the evil as with the good ; but by *intelligence* and *wisdom* is meant the faculty of seeing and of perceiving the truths and goods which are of faith and charity, and which are of love to the Lord. This faculty is not given except to those who are in illustration from the Lord ; and they are so far in illustration as they are in love to Him, and charity toward the neighbor. For *the Lord enters by good*, thus by the love and charity appertaining to man, and leads into truths corresponding to good. . . . These observations are made to the intent that it may be known, that the faith of every one is as his *love* ; and that it may be understood how it is that *truth* comes into its *light* when *love* comes into its *clearness*."

Such are the origin and nature of that *internal light* which constitutes the internal evidence of the spiritual interpretations of Holy Scripture. First of all, it enters into the internal reason of man in the form of *celestial fire* ; in which state it constitutes in man the first principle of his internal will, and his internal reason ; but in which state it is out of the conditions of Time and Space, and is 'hid with Christ in God.' It is with that superior region of the mind that angels and ministering spirits are in direct communion, and from which they see and know all that is taking place in the natural mind beneath. Being, however, a region of the mind above the direct consciousness of the individual, he has no perception of the things which are there transacted. But below this supernatural region, there is another called the

natural or external rational mind, the ideas of which are conditioned in Time and Space; and are, in the regenerate man, in such perfect correspondence with the ideas of the superior mind, that the inferior mind is the reflected image and likeness of the superior; or, to use another simile, the external mind is the body, of which the internal mind is the soul; and as the soul forms the body to its own image and likeness, so the internal reason forms to its own image and likeness the external, and is thus represented in it and by it: thus the external mind becomes the mirror of the internal.

But is the term *mirror* merely metaphorical, or does it express a corresponding reality?

Every one must agree that Christian principles are not represented faithfully in an evil life. What concord is there between Christ and Belial, or what fellowship hath light with darkness? There must be a harmony between the outer life and the inner principles, in order for the former to represent the latter; in other words, the external must correspond with the internal in order to represent it. "Correspondence," observes Swedenborg,\* "is the appearing of the internal in the external, and its representation there. Wherefore, where there is no correspondence, there is no appearing of the internal in the external; consequently, in the latter there is no representation of the former."

Representation then is effected by correspondence, and correspondence by the regeneration of the natural mind. It is only in virtue of correspondence,

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, 5423.

that spiritual ideas flow into natural, and that the natural thus becomes a mirror, a face to the spiritual; the spiritual serving as the soul, the natural as the body; the spiritual being the active power, the natural being the passive recipient; the natural being in Time and Space, the spiritual being in the Eternal world. The life which is called mystical, and is said to be 'hid with Christ in God,' belongs thus to the supernatural or spiritual region of the mind; whence it flows down into the natural, where it manifests itself in the form of love to our neighbor; from which love or charity the natural mind passes into the perception of the corresponding truths of faith. "Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God, and every one that loveth, is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God, for God is love. My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth. And hereby we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before Him."

But how does this mystical, internal, spiritual, or supernatural life, as it is variously called, flow down into the external mind? It might be thought useless or presumptuous to enquire into such a subject; and yet if this life has its laws, these laws are those of the human mind, and the knowledge of them is the highest kind of human knowledge; for it is the knowledge of those laws according to which man is created into the image and likeness of God. And, moreover, there is this advantage in attaining to a knowledge of this kind; that it includes not only a knowledge of the rational faculties, commonly so

called, but more especially of the affections, or operations of the will; a knowledge founded upon an actual discipline of the mind, thus upon a consciousness of the very affections the nature of which it is our object to ascertain. Thus, it is a philosophy of the human mind intimately connected with rules of life and conduct. The supernatural or spiritual life is actually brought down into our moral, civil, social, and domestic life; so that the highest supernatural or spiritual life is brought down into the duties of a good father or mother, a good child, and a good subject.

The way in which this is effected is indicated by St. John: "He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love." This is a truth, the knowledge of which, as existing in the memory, makes a man neither better nor worse. But if a man keeps the commandments of God, then what was only *truth* in the understanding becomes *good* in the will. The influx of the Divine love is not into the truths of a man's memory, nor into the operations of the external rational faculties, even though he were another Aristotle or Sir William Hamilton. The truths which a man knows must pass into the will, and be there transformed into good. Into this good flows good, from the Alpha and Omega of all good, through the internal man into the external; and thus the truth in the external mind becomes appropriated because it is willed. In this way only is truth implanted in the mind by the Holy Spirit.

The result of this influx of the internal mind into the external, is the elimination of a new order of

truths, called *spiritual* from the emanation of the spiritual into the natural and the subservience of the natural mind to the spiritual; just as man, who is defined to be a *rational animal*, is yet called simply *rational*, from the subservience of the animal to the rational. These spiritual truths as much belong to a spiritual degree of the mind as rational truths to a rational degree; or sensuous truths, commonly called facts, to the sensuous degree of the mind. This new order of truths is intermediate between the *supernatural* and the *natural*, and thus combines the conditions of both. It becomes the medium through which, in the human mind, the supernatural holds communion with the natural—heaven with the world. Exclude it, and you have no longer a medium of communication between the two: the result of which is, nothing is known of the supernatural; the kingdom of heaven becomes a mere figure of speech; and the supernatural itself a mere hypothesis, or myth.

But if to keep the Word of the Lord, is to cease to do evil and learn to do well; the influx of Divine good into the affections makes manifest the evil of the contrary affections. Hence the fears and fights of awakened consciences, and all those wonderful varieties of state which are set before us in the Psalms. States of sorrow:—“*The sorrows of death compassed me round about, and the pains of hell gat hold upon me.*” States of joy:—“*Oh God, my heart is fixed: I will sing and give praise.*” States of fear:—“*Fearfulness and trembling are come upon me, and horror hath overwhelmed me.*” States of despair:—“*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken*

*me?"* States of confidence:—"Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil." States of warfare:—"His truth shall be my shield and buckler. He teacheth my hands to war, and my fingers to fight." States of peace:—"Great peace have they which love Thy law."

Such are some of the innumerable states through which the natural mind passes, in the process of being made a representative, or *mirror*, of the internal mind with which angels and spirits are in communion; so that the natural subserves to man as the index of what is taking place in the supernatural region of his being; and the spiritual sense of Scripture, obtained by spiritual interpretations, consists of no other than the truths which minister to this representation. Take away from such a man the spiritual sense of Scripture, and you cut off his intercourse with heaven; you leave him to die of famine: hungry and thirsty his soul fainteth in him; you obliterate that part of the mind which is their receptacle; and, if man be designed to be the image and likeness of God, take away that which creates him into this image and likeness, and you take away his humanity; and humanity being taken away, Divinity will disappear with it. It is the son who acknowledges the existence of a father; but take away filialty, and there will be no paternity; man will become a fool, and Nature will become God.

The denial of the spiritual sense of Scripture in the interpretation of the Book of Revelation, corresponds with the denial of Divine wisdom in the interpretation of the Book of Nature. Atheism is

the literalism of natural philosophy, as literalism is the atheism of Christianity. For as the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy; so the testimony of a Divine Creator is the spirit of Natural Philosophy. Carry out to its legitimate results the denial of the spiritual sense of Scripture, and there will be no more foundation for Natural than for Revealed Theology. In the end Christianity must become extinct; and in its place will prevail that outspoken Atheism which, even now, has among so many classes spread desolation.

Admit, on the other hand, the spiritual sense of the Word of God, and the Lord with His own Divine light enters by influx into the natural sense of the Word, and into the light thereof abiding in man. "In this case," observes Swedenborg,\* "man acknowledges the truth from an interior perception, and afterwards sees it in his own thought; and this as often as he is in the affection of truth for truth's sake; for perception comes from affection, and thought from perception, and thence arises acknowledgment which is called faith." It is this state of mind which makes the countenance beautiful, and imparts to it its peculiarly Christian aspect.

"Beautiful," says Mr. Isaac Williams,† "is the human countenance as considered with regard to itself only, as seen in the external features; of wonderful adaption, contrivance, and form; but how much more so when lit up with the light of the soul within, that hidden mysterious light which kindles

\* *The Doctrine of the New Jerusalem respecting the Sacred Scriptures*, art. 58.

† *Beginning of the Book of Genesis*, p. 125.



into life, and speaks through the outward lineaments, but only partially and faintly expresses itself through them; living, as it were, in a spiritual world of its own, which lies beyond the visible countenance."

So much for the external evidence of that *spiritual light* which flows first of all into the internal reason of man, in which state it is described by Swedenborg as a *gentle burning flame* ;\* and from which, in the natural mind, it enkindles the will with new affections, and thence enlightens the understanding with new light—*veritable light* from Him who is 'the LIGHT of the World.'

It has, however, been maintained, that the first step toward a true knowledge of the Bible is not interpretation, but *Criticism* ; because, before we expound an author, we ought to procure the most correct text of that author ; in fine, that unless we know what are the words which the author has used, we do not know what are the words we have to interpret. But it becomes a serious question whether this rule has not been woefully abused. Being regarded as first in the order of theological study, it has also come to be regarded as first in importance ; and the result has been, that it has for the most part superseded every other enquiry ; so that while progress has been made in the criticism of the Sacred Scriptures, no progress has been made in its Inter-

\* From the *Veni Creator* :—

"Thou art the Comforter ; the gift  
Of God most high ; the *fire of love*,  
The everlasting spring of joy,  
And holy wisdom from above."

pretation, and the doctrine of Inspiration has dwindled down into a mere tradition. Criticism may furnish the genuine text, but can never furnish the interpretation. It has indeed attempted to do so, because it is concerned with the meaning of words, not with the meaning of things. Hence its connection with the literal and grammatical sense, with figurative or metaphorical interpretation of words. But where the mind has been absorbed with the meaning of words only, its habitual study of the letter confines it to the letter, and makes it intensely averse to anything higher. The critical scholar, therefore, in ascertaining the meaning of words, looks for their meaning in the mind of the author; and it being assumed in the case of the Bible, that the writer is the same with the author, hence naturally flows the rule, that we are to interpret the Bible in the same manner as any other book. The doctrine of Inspiration is accordingly adapted to this view of the case. So that it has been said, 'That with the Apostles of old, Divine Inspiration supplied the place of human learning; but with the Apostles of modern times, human learning supplies the place of Divine Inspiration.' No wonder that in such a case grammarians, linguists, critics, antiquarians, and logicians should supply the place of *prophets*; and employ their learning in pointing out the errors of Inspiration.

Accordingly it is observed by one of these writers that—

“ The labors of critics have been tending to make it more and more manifest, that the popularly received opinions regarding the strict historical accuracy of the Pentateuch are

untenable ; and that we must regard these venerable books, not as the homogeneous compositions of a single author, who was inspired to draw up an infallible record of primeval history, but as memorials of the past which were handed down, partly in written documents, and partly by oral tradition,—which were thus in part liable to all the alterations and legendary additions incident to the last-mentioned mode of transmission ; and which, after being digested by an older writer, were eventually amplified by men who viewed the early part, in a considerable degree, through the medium supplied by later events and contemporary institutions.”

“If,” says the Editor of this criticism, “there are some things in the Pentateuch which we cannot piously suppose to have proceeded immediately from Jehovah Himself, nor even to be worthy of His servant Moses ; it is comforting to remember how little is, or can be known, of the authorship of the books which go by His name.”

“The work of Interpretation remains to be undertaken, and that work cannot be carried through, without sitting in judgment, as it has been invidiously called, upon the inspired writers.”

Now, as far as mere critics have hitherto undertaken the work of Interpretation, they have shewn themselves faithful fellow-laborers in the school of Bishop Marsh, and zealously contend for *a single sense* : consequently, are directly *opposed to any spiritual interpretation*, whether of the Old or New Testament. Moreover, they cordially agree with that school of Theology which says that the Law is *dead*, and that the Old Testament has *passed away* : only they would further remind the Church, that having carried out these principles into the investigation of the Old Testament, they would investigate the New

upon the same principles ; and accordingly, say they,—

“ If after an unprejudiced enquiry we are driven to conclude, that the Gospels have not always preserved a perfectly accurate record of the life of Christ ; if his discourses, after being long handed down by oral transmission, and occasionally modified and coloured by the prepossessions and imaginations of the reporters, have not invariably maintained their original and genuine character ; if we see reason to believe that the apostles made use of some reasonings which were inconclusive, entertained some opinions which were unfounded, and differed more or less from one another on points of Christian doctrine ; it would seem that our range of scriptural data for the settlement of doctrinal questions may be thereby restricted.”

From the statements already made in the present Tract, we must leave the reader to form his own conclusions with respect to the position which Swedenborg's writings occupy in the present controversy concerning the Inspiration and Interpretation of the Scriptures ; reminding him, at the same time, of the remark of an author already quoted ;\* that

“ Every accession to our knowledge, every new argument which throws light upon the structure—the anatomy if you will—or the *meaning* of Holy Scripture, every fresh particle of truth, *from whatever theological school it proceeds*, we ought indeed most thankfully to receive.”

If, in the passages quoted from Swedenborg, there may appear to some a strangeness and novelty in the mode of expression, or in the manner of contemplating the human mind (as when speaking of various

\* *Sermons* by Lord Arthur Hervey, p. 29.

*degrees* in the mind, of *influx*, of the *internal* and *external* mind, not to mention other expressions) ; it should be remembered, that *the subject itself is new*, viz., *the laws which regulate the spiritual life*, regarded as the life of the will and the life of the intellect ; in other words, the laws by which the supernatural descends into the natural and becomes represented in it. Those laws are as much laws of order as any which regulate the logical processes of thought, and the life founded upon them constitutes Angelic Wisdom ; for they are the laws by which the Infinite causes itself to be represented in the finite, the Divine in the human ; and when that representation is accomplished, then are fulfilled upon earth those words of the Apocalypse, "*And they shall see His face, and His name shall be on their foreheads.*"

---

#### APPENDIX.

" With regard to such passages as are thought to breathe a cruel or vindictive spirit, unlike the spirit of the Gospel, the answer will probably be of a mixed nature, and will perhaps lead to the discovery of a peculiar class of texts, where the words are man's words with one meaning, and the words of the Spirit at the same time with another meaning. David may, in that spirit of oriental vindictiveness which had not yet been tamed by the love and pity of a crucified Redeemer, or by the Spirit of the risen and ascended Saviour,—David may have been praying for the punishment of his own inveterate enemies, and yet the Spirit may have used the very same words as prophetic of the judgments which would be brought down upon those who betrayed and crucified the Lord of glory."—*The Inspiration of Holy Scripture*. Five Sermons. By the Rev. Lord Arthur Hervey, M.A., etc. ; p. 73.

INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION :

BEING AN

ENQUIRY INTO THE RELATION BETWEEN THE DIVINE  
AND HUMAN ELEMENTS

IN

THE WORD OF GOD.

BY THE REV. AUGUSTUS CLISSOLD, M.A.,

FORMERLY OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

No. III.

---

"My Lord, I do not know that a more important controversy than this has engaged the attention of the Church for three hundred years; and that it will be decided, is as sure as that there is a God in heaven."—*Defence of the Rev. Rowland Williams, D.D., in the Court of Arches*; p. 319.

---


OXFORD :

HENRY HAMMANS, HIGH STREET.

LONDON :

WHITTAKER AND CO.

1862.



LONDON :  
MITCHELL AND SON, PRINTERS,  
WARDOUR STREET, W.

## INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION.

---

HAVE the words of Scripture more than one meaning—a spiritual as well as a literal? If so, to what books of Scripture, or what passages, does this principle of Interpretation apply; and what are the rules of its application? This is the question now agitated by theologians;—a question which is destined to put the Church of England,—nay, the whole Catholic Church, upon its trial.

“Here\* we find ourselves, as might have been foreseen,” say the *Aids to Faith*, “in undisguised conflict with the Sceptical writers of our own time. That Scripture has *one meaning*, and *one meaning only*, is their fundamental axiom: it is seen to be and felt to be one of the keys of their position.”

How came these writers into possession of this key? Has not Bishop Marsh shewn that it was in the hands of the Church, before it was in the hands of the Sceptics? Did the Church hand over the key to the Sceptics? So say the Sceptics: ‘We are only adhering,’ they affirm, ‘to the principles maintained at the Reformation, and from thence down to the present time, viz., that, as a general rule, Scrip-

\* *Aids to Faith*, p. 392.



ture has one meaning, and one meaning only.' Now, as that one meaning is the literal, and the literal meaning is the human element : so the literal meaning only is the human element *only*, and as such excludes the Divine, consequently Divine Inspiration. The greater part of the Bible, therefore, as interpreted upon this principle, is not the Word of God, nor is it divinely inspired, in the strict sense of the terms. It relates to matters of history and science, and contains a certain amount of poetry ; but the human element contemplated apart from the Divine being fallible, it ought to excite no surprise, say the sceptics, if in matters of history and science the Bible should be wrong, and even some of its poetry be more than indifferent.

"Great\* disquiet has been excited of late years in the minds of pious persons, by the fact that the advancing discoveries of Geology have appeared to conflict with the statements of Genesis regarding the formation of the world, and its various constituent elements ; and strenuous efforts have been made to reconcile these discrepancies."—Now if discrepancies exist on one subject, why not, it is asked, upon others ? If because discrepancies exist, it be argued that the Almighty did not intend that Revelation should give us a correct account of *Geological* facts ; why must we suppose He intended to give us a correct account of *historical* facts ? Accordingly it is maintained, that "the labors of critics have been tending to make it more and more manifest, that the

\* *Brief Examination of Prevalent Opinions on Inspiration*, by a Layman ; p. 144. Edited by the Rev. H. B. Wilson.

popularly received opinions regarding the strict historical accuracy of the Pentateuch, are untenable.”

Is it the fact, then, that in the first chapter of Genesis, any such statement is made as to oblige us, in all candor and honesty, to admit that the narrative is nothing more than an ancient legend? In answering this question, what have they to say who have undertaken to defend the narrative? One says, it is a series of visions; another, it is a parable; another, an unfulfilled plan; another, a *Psalm*.

The mere fact of this dissidence among the defenders of the faith is regarded by others as a very serious matter:—

“To\* urge such suppositions is not to defend the ark of God, but to abandon it to the enemy. If the first chapter of Genesis be poetry, or vision, or parable, it is not historic truth, which is just what objectors assert. . . . Are we to believe that Divine revelation begins with an unscientific misstatement of physical truth? If the first chapter be the offspring of human error, where does Divine truth begin?”

Accordingly, the first chapter of Genesis is to be understood, says Dr. Sewell, in the strictly literal sense, although not in that alone :†—

“There is an account given us by Moses, who, unless the whole history of the Pentateuch, and of the Jews, and of our Saviour and of His Church, be one monstrous imposture, and delusion, and blasphemy, must have been authorized by God to write what he has written—there is an account very brief,

\* *Aids to Faith*, p. 198, 199.

† *A Letter on the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, addressed to a Student*, by W. Sewell, D.D., late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford; p. 42.

but very simple and positive, perfectly divested of all appearance of poetry, or fiction, or legendary romance, or philosophic theory; an account so simple, so historical in its form and character, that if it be not intended to be taken literally, the form of it must act as a deception, and that deception sanctioned and warranted by all the later Prophets and Apostles, our Lord Himself included, who have subsequently referred to and adopted it as true;—there is an account that God in six days made the heavens and the earth, and all the living things in the earth, in a certain order. And all the testimony which declares to us the inspiration of Scripture, declares it to us, including the Book of Genesis. The very name of the book proves this.”

Dr. Sewell seems, however, aware of the signs of the times in relation to this subject :\*—

“There is,” says he, “at this moment, especially in younger minds, a fevered anxious looking for some possible contingency, some new discovery of Science, some keener criticism, some development of intellect, which may shake and shatter to fragments the whole fabric of our Christian belief. It is this *coming era of new enlightenment*, which forms the boast of the infidel and the alarm of the weak believer; and the vague prospect and menace of which seem almost to paralyze the arms even of the bravest defenders of their faith. We are advancing, it is said, each day: Progress, the spread of knowledge, sound criticism, all is bearing us onward upon a course, of which none can see the end; only we can discern that we are slipping from our moorings; and the land on which we once stood firm, the solid, clearly discerned ground of objective Gospel truth, is shifting before us. Are we quitting it for ever? Must we abandon it?”

“God† only knows how rapidly is coming upon us, rising

\* *Ibid.*, p. 31.

† *Ibid.*, p. 63.

out of a little cloud no bigger than a man's hand, the storm of whirlwind and tempest, which will destroy the very principles of faith from the face of the earth."

In the *Replies* to the Essayists are presentiments of a similar future :\*—

"As the revival of literature in the sixteenth century produced the Reformation, so the growth of the critical spirit, and the change that has come over mental science, and the mere increase of knowledge of all kinds, threaten now a *revolution* less external, but not less *profound*."

In like manner, what says the Critic?†—

"It does not, however, fall within the scope of this treatise to make any attempt to foretell what may be the dogmatical results of the admission of a *fallible* element in the Scriptures. And a very little consideration will suffice to shew, that it would be quite impossible to predict, with any approach to exactness, the form which the Theology of the future will assume. For that *it must undergo some change*, appears—if we may judge from the history of the past—to be inevitable."

So again the *Defence of Dr. Williams* in the Court of Arches :‡—

"My Lord, I do not know that a more important controversy than this has engaged the attention of the Church for three hundred years, and that it will be decided, is as sure as that there is a God in heaven."

In this controversy there are two questions at issue: the one, whether in matters of science and history the Bible be occasionally wrong: the other,

\* *Replies to Essays and Reviews*, p. 348.

† *Brief Examination of Prevalent Opinions on Inspiration*, by a Layman; p. 242.

‡ *Defence of Dr. Williams*, p. 319.

whether, even supposing it to be right, it can always lay claim to being *Divinely inspired*, by having always a Divine element within the human ; thus whether it can lay claim to be called the Word of God. These are two distinct questions. The latter is the only one with which we are at present concerned, because it is the only one which directly involves the subject of Divine Inspiration ; for even granting the Bible to be right in matters of science and history, this would not prove it to be *Divinely inspired*. We have already said, that the Divine Inspiration consists in a spiritual sense being contained within the literal, a Divine element within the human. But the sceptics affirm that "Scripture has one meaning, and one meaning only : this is seen and felt to be one of the keys of their position." How has this been answered ? By alleging its spiritual sense ? Let us take the evidence of a modern Church Periodical :\*—

"The infidel could not proceed a step in discrediting the Bible as the vehicle of Inspiration and truth, without Professor Jowett's theory that every passage of Scripture is to be tied down to one literal meaning ; we are thankful therefore to find that this subject is submitted to *the most searching enquiry*. It is obvious, and yet we have not seen it remarked, that all the cavils against the inspiration of the first chapter of Genesis, are based on this fallacy."

What fallacy ? That the Scripture is tied down to one literal meaning in the first chapter of Genesis. Where then is its spiritual meaning ? In the *Aids to Faith* ? In the *Seven Replies* ? In the answers entitled *Faith and Peace* ? In any other of the

\* *Literary Churchman*, Feb. 15, 1862.

innumerable answers? Point it out, if any one can; if he cannot, what is the cause of this omission? The general principle of a spiritual sense has indeed been acknowledged; as by Mr. Isaac Williams in his *Beginning of the Book of Genesis*, and in the *Types of Genesis* by Mr. A. Jukes. These works, however, have but recently been published: they are comparatively unknown; and the former is rather a collection of devotional meditations, than the result of any formal system of interpretation; the reason of which we shall see in the sequel. In the meantime, the controversy is fast developing itself into a battle between the spiritual and merely literal systems of interpretation—the battle of THE WORD OF GOD. Upon the issue of this contest will depend the future of the Church, and the Church of the Future. It has now come to be acknowledged that\*—"a mere literalist, no doubt, can scarcely be said to believe in any Inspiration at all. He has limited himself to the one human writer, to the exclusion of the Inspiring Spirit."

Well, then, let us endeavor to find out by "*a most searching enquiry*," what is the reason that the first Chapter of Genesis has been tied down to one literal meaning, to the exclusion of the spiritual; or rather, what is the reason that this method of Interpretation has been applied to nearly the whole *Word of God*. We are thankful, says a Church Periodical, to find that this subject is submitted to "*a most searching enquiry*."—"Enquiry upon these subjects," we are assured, "has become a necessity;"—

\* *Guardian*, March 5, 1862.

"Infidelity\* is assailing us afresh, and with a power and under circumstances sufficiently new to invest its assault with a character of special danger. It is no longer the coarse and shallow and unsatisfying infidelity of last century. It appeals, on the contrary, to the deepest and highest faculties in human nature, and it is equipped for the conflict with an array of profound and extensive historical and philological criticism. It claims, more than ever, to speak in the interests of knowledge, morality, and truth, against a theology irreconcilable with them."

Are there, then, certain Sacred Books entitled to be received as *the Word of God* in the strictest sense of the terms, in virtue of their having a Divine element within the human? Are we, in fine, in possession of any *Word of God* at all? We maintain that there are certain books entitled to this claim. The question, it is said, is not whether the books called the Word of God constitute the Bible, but whether they are contained in the Bible. No: the question first of all is, What do we mean by the *Word of God*? When this is once settled, we may proceed to consider whether these books constitute the canon or are contained in the canon. The former is a question which relates to Inspiration, the latter more properly to canonicity.

Our argument is directed not so much against Scepticism as against the causes of Scepticism.—What, then, do we mean by the *Word of God*? for upon the meaning of this expression will depend the doctrine of Divine Inspiration. The meaning is thus laid down by the Church of England, in the Book of *Homilies*.

\* Replies to the *Essays and Reviews*, p. 348.

“Consider\* that the Scripture, in what strange form soever it be pronounced, is the Word of the living God; let that always come to your remembrance, which is so oft repeated of the prophet Esaias: ‘The mouth of the Lord,’ saith he, ‘hath spoken it; the Almighty and Everlasting God, who with his only word created heaven and earth, hath decreed it: the Lord of Hosts, whose ways are in the seas, whose paths are in the deep waters; that Lord and God, by whose word all things in heaven and in earth are created, governed, and preserved, hath so provided it. The God of gods, and Lord of all lords, yea, God that is God alone, incomprehensible, almighty, and everlasting, he hath spoken it, it is his word.’ It cannot, therefore, be but truth, which proceedeth from the God of all truth; it cannot but be wisely and prudently commanded what Almighty God hath devised, how vainly soever, through want of grace, we miserable wretches do imagine and judge of his most holy Word.”

‘This,’ it is said by opponents, ‘is, nevertheless, an opinion and not a doctrine: the authors of the *Homilies* had a right to give their *opinion* in a work designed to consist of mere popular harangues; but it is nowhere laid down by the Church of England as her *doctrine*.’ Now I shall not refer to the Westminster Confession, but to another work not alluded to on either side—*The Doctrine of the New Jerusalem respecting the Sacred Scripture*, by Emanuel Swedenborg. The first article is, “That the Sacred Scripture or the Word is Divine Truth itself.” Accordingly Swedenborg observes;—

“It is universally confessed that the Word is from God, is divinely inspired, and consequently Holy; but still it has remained a secret to this day in what

\* Second Tome: Homily 10: *An Information*, etc., 2nd Part.



part of the Word its Divinity resides ; inasmuch as in the letter it appears like a common writing, composed in a strange style, neither so sublime nor so elegant as that which distinguishes the best secular compositions. Hence it is, that whosoever worships Nature instead of God, or in preference to God, and in consequence of such worship makes himself and his own *proprium* the centre and fountain of his thoughts, instead of deriving them out of heaven from the Lord, may easily fall into error concerning the Word, and into contempt for it ; and say within himself whilst he reads it, ‘ What is the meaning of this passage ? What the meaning of that ? Is it possible that this should be Divine ? Is it possible that God, whose wisdom is infinite, should speak in such a manner ? Where is its holiness ? Or whence can it be derived but from superstition and credulity ? ’

“ He however who reasons thus, does not reflect that Jehovah the Lord, who is God of heaven and earth, spake the Word by Moses and the prophets ; and that consequently it must be Divine Truth ; inasmuch as what Jehovah the Lord himself speaks can be nothing else. Nor does such a one consider that the Lord, who is the same with Jehovah, spake the Word written by the Evangelists, many parts from his own mouth, and the rest from the Spirit of his mouth, which is the Holy Spirit. Hence it is, as He Himself declares, that in His words there is life ; and that He is the Light which enlightens, and that He is the Truth.”

In conformity with the same view of the subject Dr. Wordsworth observes ;—

"Not\* only are the *writers* of Holy Scripture moved by the Holy Ghost; but the *writing* itself, every part of the whole *writing*, is described by St. Paul as filled with the breath of God. The Book is inspired, and therefore the Scriptures are called *living* oracles, and are represented as *speaking*, and as endued with *foreknowledge*. The Spirit of God animates them. They are saturated and bathed with the Divine Light. They become Light. '*Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my paths.*'"

Thus far concerning the *Divinity* of the Word of God. But the Bible, we are told,† in whatever light we regard it, presents to us *two* distinct elements, the *Divine* and the *Human*. On the one hand, God has granted a Revelation; on the other, human language has been made a channel to convey, and men have been chosen as the agents to record it. From this point all theories on the subject of Inspiration take their rise; and all the varieties of opinion respecting it, have sprung from the manner in which the fact referred to has been taken into the account.

There are two leading systems in this department of Theology: the one suggested by the prominence assigned to the *Divine* element: the other by the prominence assigned to the *human*. The former of these systems practically ignores the human element of the Bible: the latter, the Divine, and is (we are told) the characteristic of the great majority of modern theories of Inspiration.

\* *The Inspiration of the Bible. Five Lectures delivered in Westminster Abbey.* By C. Wordsworth, D.D., etc., p. 10.

† *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture, etc.* By W. Lee, D.D., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin; and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin. *Second Edition*, p. 18.

The whole difficulty, in regard to Divine Inspiration, lies in adjusting the relation between the Divine and human elements;—

“The difficulty,” says Professor Browne,\* “of enunciating a definite theory of Inspiration consists exactly in this—in assigning the due weight respectively to the Divine and human elements. . . . It seems pretty generally agreed among thoughtful men at present, that definite theories of Inspiration are doubtful and dangerous. The existence of a human element, and the existence of a Divine element, are generally acknowledged; but the exact relation of the one to the other it may be difficult to define.”

The reason, here stated, for which no definite theory of Inspiration can be given, is, because it is difficult to assign any definite relation between the Divine and human elements. A similar reason is assigned by Dr. Wordsworth,† “The union of God and Man in the *Incarnate Word* is a Mystery. So is the union of the Divine element with the human in the *Written Word*. It is a Mystery. In both cases the Mystery baffles all our powers of analysis.” For who, says Dr. Wordsworth, would attempt to define the limits where God’s nature ends, and where man’s nature begins, in the Person of Christ?

“The almost unanimous voice of Christendom,” says Mr. Swainson,‡ “rejects the thought that the Books are merely human: but yet the considerations I laid before you on

\* *Aids to Faith*, p. 318, 303.

† *The Inspiration of the Bible. Five Lectures delivered in Westminster Abbey.* Page 7.

‡ *The Authority of the New Testament, etc.* By C. A. Swainson, M.A., Principal of the Theological College and Prebendary of Chichester, etc.; p. 143, 144.

Sunday, as clearly shew that they are not all purely divine.—What then is my object now in drawing your attention to this? It is chiefly, I may say, only to help you to see that the precise point wherein the difficulty lies is *the point of union* of these two principles; and there to leave it. *I cannot solve the difficulty and I am not attempting to do it. . . .* Any mode of reconciling these facts *I cannot give* to you; nor do I think that one exists. And so, my brethren, as a book *we leave it. . .* It stands unique; it stands alone. We cannot therefore consider it as coming under any law, it cannot be understood by any analogy: law, that is, of other writings; analogy, that is, of other books. It is human: it is Divine.”

The grand difficulty, therefore, which perplexes theologians with regard to the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures, lies in *the union of the Divine and human elements*. But as the Bible is the “written Word of God,” and our Lord the “living Word of God,” the origin of the difficulty lies in the prior and corresponding union of the Divine and human natures in the Person of our Lord Himself. Hence, the language of Dr. Hey in regard to the union of the two natures in the living Word, is much the same with that of Mr. Swainson in regard to the union of the two elements in the written Word.

“I confess I do not understand,” says he,\* “how the Divine and human natures are joined in Him.” “I own this connection with humanity, and enjoying rewards, to be above my comprehension; and I believe it to be above the comprehension of every man.” What is the reason of this? “We own,” says Dr.

\* *Lectures in Divinity delivered to the University of Cambridge*, book iv., art. ii., sec. xxvi., xxxii. *Ibid.*, art. iv., sec. xx.

Hey, "that we *cannot reconcile* Christ's Divine qualities with his human."—How then does the case stand? The qualities of the Divine nature cannot be conceived as reconciled with those of the human nature; and yet we are to believe that "the Divine and human natures united in Christ are never to be divided; are *inseparabiliter conjunctæ*." The difficulty lies, then, in conceiving how two things which cannot, in our thoughts, be reconciled with each other, are nevertheless to be conceived as inseparably conjoined; how, in fine, the Bridegroom can be inseparably conjoined to the Bride, while the two remain unreconciled to each other. In ordinary life such an inseparable connection is commonly spoken of as an unhappy marriage: there is a nominal union, but a real disunion; an external inseparability, but an internal separation: such a state being anything but a state of sabbatical peace. No wonder therefore that, in this case, as there is no real marriage-union between the Divine and human natures, the analogy should be regarded as having no foundation, and consequently as visionary. Therefore, as Dr. Hey says, "this part seems little attended to by Commentators;" as is very natural with what is above the comprehension of every man: and why should not Commentators attend as little to the union of the Divine and human elements in the written Word, as to the union of the Divine and human natures in the living Word?

Upon this subject, however, we are prudently warned that Scylla and Charybdis are both to be avoided.

If we give undue prominence to the Divine, we fall into the error of the Apollinarians and Eutychians.

If we give undue prominence to the human, we fall into the error of the Socinians. If we assign too great a difference between the Divine and human natures, we fall into the error of the Nestorians. The difference between the controversies in the early Church and those in the present day is this, that in the former case, the doctrine of the union of the Divine with the Human had reference to the Personal Word and not the Written; in the present day, it has reference both to the Written Word and to the Personal. In this lies the magnitude of the contest.

Now the doctrine of a Plenary Inspiration of Scripture is opposed to that of its *partial* inspiration; and the doctrine of its *partial* inspiration is that which has been most generally received. "All *parts* are not of equal necessity or weight," says Baxter; and Bishop Warburton says, "Thus\* we see the advantages resulting from a *partial* inspiration. . . ."—This doctrine of the *partial* inspiration of the written Word has its counterpart in the doctrine of the *partial* union of the human and Divine in the Person of the living Word. "Were the question asked," says Mr. Mansel,† "in the form which the context of my words fairly suggests,—namely, is the Church of England prepared to say that the Human Nature of Christ is but a *partial* not a *complete*, a relative not an absolute manifestation of God? Every moderately well-informed theologian would at once reply in the affirmative." For,‡ "The essence of Deity is one

\* *Defence of Dr. Williams*, p. 132, 142.

† *Second Letter to Professor Goldwyn Smith*, p. 62.

‡ *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, p. 26.

thing ; the essence of humanity is another. Were it not so, the Apollinarian or the Eutychian heresy would be the true Catholic Faith."

Thus for example : Dr. Lee, when speaking of the Inspiration of the written Word of God, observes,—  
"In short the Divine and human elements, mutually interpenetrating and combined, form one vital, organic whole ;—not mechanically, still less ideally, but, as it has been termed, dynamically united"—  
"words," says Mr. Swainson,\* "which might almost have been taken from the error of Eutyches as to the two natures blended into one."

Thus a plenary union instead of a partial, is Eutychianism !

If now the difficulties concerning the union of the Divine and human elements in the Written Word, may be traced up to corresponding difficulties concerning the union of the Divine and human natures in the Personal Word ; so we may, finally, trace up the difficulties concerning the latter to the doctrines which are held concerning the *miraculous conception*.

For instance ; when it is said that Mary was the mother of God, or that it was the *Divinity* which was the Son of God, and not the *humanity*, in this case the prominence is given to the Divine Nature. When the miraculous conception is denied or ignored, and hence the Divinity of the Messiah, the prominence is given to the human nature. When each nature is regarded as so different the one from the other, that the one is united to the other not by the influx of the Divine into the human, but simply by a co-

\* *Authority of the New Testament*, etc., p. 147.

existence of the two in one Person, as in the doctrine of Pre-established harmony (which is in reality the prevailing doctrine), there is no real but only a nominal union.

And if the union of the Divine and human natures ceases to be real, for the same reason there can be no real union of heaven with earth; no real union of the Church in heaven with the Church upon earth; no real union of the spiritual world with the natural, or of the supernatural with the natural; whence an entire disbelief in angelic appearances, a denial of miracles altogether, and of the exercise of Divine Power in the creation of the world. Thus, for instance,\* it is said :—

“Of course, if Professor Baden Powell’s theory be true, that the physical and spiritual worlds are so *separate* that they can never come into contact, then all this is impossible. But then all creation is impossible. The spiritual could never have created the material. Indeed, the union of soul and body must be impossible; at all events, all religious knowledge must be impossible. It can be founded on no evidence, and can result only from certain convictions of the mind, wholly incapable of being tested as to their truth.”

Thus a partial union or no union in the one case, leads to a partial union or no union in the others. When, therefore, we consider the *nature* and *extent* of the relation between the Divine and Human elements in Scripture, what vast and momentous subjects do they involve! They involve the union of the Divine and Human natures at the Incarnation; the process of perfecting that union by the glorification

\* *Aids to Faith*, p. 305.



of the Humanity; the union of Christ with his Church; the union of the Divine and human elements in the written Word of God, thus the doctrine of Divine Inspiration; the union of the spiritual world with the natural, thus of the Church in heaven with the Church upon earth, as also the appearance of angels from the Church in heaven to the Church upon earth; and, lastly, the union of the soul with the body. All these subjects are inseparably connected with each other; and no one can be treated of effectually, without comprehending them all. This is the principle upon which Swedenborg has proceeded in his wonderful treatises upon these subjects.

Let us, however, for a moment suppose that all these things are past man's comprehension; that to attempt to know them is only an attempt to be wise above what is written; that all that Swedenborg has written is mere speculation and conjecture about that which has not been revealed; that theories of Inspiration are what scepticism is ever craving for; that explanations of the union of the Divine and human elements in the Word of God, have not been vouchsafed, and as such that it is vain and unbecoming to demand them.

This is the position which the Church has held with respect to these subjects during the last century: this position it holds now, but under a marvellous change of circumstances. Enquiry has commenced; the controversy is not only of the Church with sceptics, but of the Church with herself; and the question is, what direction shall Theology take; shall it be toward the system of naturalism indicated by the

Essayists and Reviewers, or toward a system of supernaturalism, such as has been indicated by Swedenborg's writings? The intermediate course hitherto pursued, of discouraging enquiry and placing the controversy out of reach, has become no longer possible. The position is untenable, as we proceed to shew. Let the case be stated by the *Aids to Faith*.

"But\* it may be asked, how do we conceive that this Inspiration took place? What is our theory of the process? What do we conceive to be the *modus agendi* of the Holy Spirit in the heart of man? This we plainly refuse to answer. We know not, and do not presume to enquire into the *manner*; we recognize and believe in the *fact*. Individual writers may have speculated; imagery, suitable or unsuitable, may have been introduced as illustrative by a few thinkers in early ages; but the Catholic Church has never put forward a *theory*. On this subject she has always maintained a solemn reserve: she declares to us that in the Scripture the Holy Ghost speaks to us by the mouths of men; she permits us to recognize a Divine and a human element; but, in reference to the *nature, extent, and special circumstances* of the union, she warns us not to seek to be wise above what has been written, not to endanger our faith with speculations and conjectures about that which has not been revealed."

Now these, it will be granted, are opinions and not doctrines; and as such fairly open to investigation. Accordingly, as soon as we begin to enquire, they assume the character of dissolving views. There are three principal subjects which are here referred to: First, the *modus agendi* of the Holy Spirit on the heart of man;—

\* *Aids to Faith*, p. 413.

"The theory of human life," says Mr. Swainson,\* "is a mystery; the theory of our ordinary life in God is still more a mystery: the theory of that extraordinary life in God which at times apostles and prophets lived, must ever remain a mystery insoluble. Some of its characteristics we may discover: some of its properties we learn; but as it is in itself we can never know it."

Can we ever know anything as it is in itself?—However, the laws of the life that is hid with Christ in God; the laws by which the Holy Spirit takes up his abode in our spirit, and thenceforth works upon us, leading us upwards and onwards, formed the principal subject of our last Tract; where it was seen, that the spiritual life is subject to laws, that those laws are the laws of goodness and truth, and as such constitute the spiritual sense of Scripture. The spiritual life, therefore, was seen to be, what it has been admitted to be, not only a legitimate but a most useful and important subject of investigation.

Secondly, as to the *nature* of Inspiration, we shall find that enquiry into it is strongly recommended. For instance:—

"With reference," says Dr. Lee,† "to the *nature* of Inspiration itself, and to the possibility of reconciling the unquestionable stamp of *humanity* impressed upon every page of the Bible, with that undoubting belief in its *perfection* and *infalibility* which is the Christian's most precious inheritance,—it may safely be maintained that in English theology almost *nothing has been done*; and that no effort has hitherto been made to grapple directly with the difficulties of the subject. At least I am unacquainted with any works in our language

\* *Authority of the New Testament*, etc., p. 133.

† *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, Preface to First Edition, p. 16.

(with the exception of Mr. Westcott's *Gospel Harmony*, where some valuable but brief remarks are thrown out incidentally, and the treatise of Mr. Morell, to which I shall presently revert) that even profess to entertain the question."\*

Now why is it that *nothing has been done* with regard to enquiry into the *nature* of the Inspiration of Scripture? Is it because such an investigation would be presumptuous or unprofitable? Not in the least; for it seems that as soon as enquiry is commenced in earnest :†—

"Valuable hints, casting light upon the *nature of Inspiration*, are being continually suggested; conclusive evidence in reply to the cavils of objectors is gradually accumulating; many positive arguments in support of the Church's belief in the divine influence under which the Bible was composed, repeatedly present themselves in the writings of theologians; but the information thus existing is only to be discovered after *diligent and patient toil*."

On the other hand, what is the consequence of neglecting this enquiry into the *nature* of Inspiration?—

"There has gradually sprung up a want of *definiteness*, and an absence of *consistency* in the language used when speaking of Inspiration; owing to which, those who are most sincere in maintaining the Divine character of the Bible, have not unfrequently been betrayed into concessions fatal to its supreme authority.—And not only is there a *vagueness* in the language which most writers employ when approaching this topic, there is also a want of completeness in the method usually adopted when discussing it."

\* The works of Swedenborg, all of which are translated into English, and have passed through numerous editions, are full of the subject.

† Dr. Lee on *Inspiration*, etc., Preface, p. 17.

But do the consequences of this neglect end here? By no means; for here the Sceptics take up the subject:—

“Here we find ourselves, as might have been foreseen, in undisguised conflict with the sceptical writers of our own time. That Scripture has *one meaning* and *one meaning only* is their fundamental axiom; it is seen to be and felt to be one of the keys of their position.”

But who are the sceptical writers? Ought it to surprise us that many of them are Clergymen of the Church of England? \*—

“They tell us in language of unrestrained confidence, that no man of candour can fail to acknowledge the existence not only of mistakes as to matters of minor importance, but of such positive ‘patches of human passion and error,’ such ‘weakness of memory,’ or such ‘mingling of it with imagination,’ such ‘feebleness of inference, such confusion of illustration with argument,’ and such variations in judgment and opinion, that in the study of Scripture we must continually have recourse to ‘a rectifying or verifying faculty,’ that we may properly be enabled to *separate the Divine from the human*,’—what is true, real, and unprejudiced, from what is perverted, mistaken, and false.”

Now, observes Dr. Williams,† “I say the Church has left open every question as to the *nature* and *mode* of Inspiration in general; and also in particular the question as to the particular kind of Inspiration to be ascribed to a given passage.”

“Is‡ it credible, that if the Church had held any broad, intelligible doctrine on the subject of the Inspiration, the criticism, or the Interpretation of the Bible, that declaration

\* *Aids to Faith*, p. 414.

† See his *Defence*, p. 171.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

should be absent from the Thirty-nine Articles, the three Creeds, and the Catechism?"

So much for the state of the Church with regard to the *nature* of Inspiration. What has she to say concerning the *extent* of Divine Inspiration in the Scripture, or what are called the "proportions" of the Divine and Human elements?

"Theories\* of inspiration is what scepticism is ever craving for; it is the voice of hapless unbelief that is ever loudest in its call for explanation of the manner of the assumed union of the Divine with the human, or of the *proportions* in which each element is to be admitted and recognised. Such explanations have not been vouchsafed, and it is as vain and unbecoming to demand them, as it is to require a theory of the union of the Divinity and Humanity in the person of Christ, or an estimate of the *proportions* in which the two perfect natures are to be conceived to co-exist."

But has not this position become equally untenable with the former? For suppose the Church of England to hold no definite doctrine upon the "proportion" of the Divine and Human elements in Scripture, it is of course an open question; and the "proportions of the Spirit to the letter" will depend entirely upon the theological school of the expositor. Hence they who believe that the Law has *expired*, that it is *dead*, that the Old Testament was identified with the Old Dispensation, and as such has passed away, may reduce those proportions—*ad libitum*.

"Thus† there is no impropriety in saying of the Sacred Volume, that it is all sacred, yet not all *equally* sacred. The

\* *Aids to Faith*, p. 413.

† *The Letter and the Spirit*, by Charles P. Chretien, M.A., p. 142.

consecrating Spirit is in it everywhere, and yet not everywhere in the same way. No one here present, I suppose, doubts that the *proportion* of Spirit to letter, of outward visible sign to inward spiritual grace, of type and thing typified, of ceremonial law and spiritual freedom, is different under the Christian and under the Jewish Dispensation. And the difference which exists between the Dispensations is morally sure to leave its traces in the *Record*."

Now, it is the spirit which giveth life; but what is the *proportion* of the Spirit to the letter in a *dead* Law? Well may we say with Baxter, that "We have great cause to take heed of overvaluing its use to us!" Well may Dr. Williams exclaim; "God's Word written proves nothing for the prosecutors; it may mean *pars pro toto*; it may mean Scripture in so far as it is the Word of God:" for the proportion in which the Divine and human elements are to be recognized, is left by the Church undetermined. Here then, as is admitted, enquiry is absolutely necessary. For how can you have an indefinite doctrine of Inspiration, and a definite rule of Interpretation; particularly when the interpretation depends upon those relations of the Divine and human elements into which we must not inquire? Will not the interpretations themselves be as indefinite as the rule; and the rule as indefinite as the doctrine; and the doctrine as indefinite as the theory, if there be any? If, in this case, the Christian should seek for *spiritual* interpretations, what *rule* is there to guide him? The answer is—what might be expected;—

"On\* such a subject, then, *no rule can be laid down*; this

\* *Aids to Faith*, p. 452.

only may be said, that he who reads Scripture under the persuasion that it often contains depths not yet sounded, and meanings not yet ascertained, will certainly read it with far greater spiritual profit to himself, than he who believes he has fully arrived at the mind of Scripture, when he has made out the mere outward meaning of the letter."

Accordingly, we are told that sevenfold, eightfold, and if we chose to press the words of Erigena,\* *infinite* senses of Scripture were admitted by mediæval interpreters. In the present day, Mr. Neale goes so far as to admit quadruple or even yet *more manifold* senses; and Mr. Isaac Williams observes;† "As with the works so is it with the words of men, they have one signification, and that limited: it is not so with the words of God; they unfold their meanings according to men, times, and circumstances." And this, says Augustin, is not the uncertainty but the fecundity of Scripture. "In determining the extent of this species of interpretation," says Dr. Van Mildert,‡ "there is considerable difficulty;" and in respect to the parables,—“great judgment is often necessary, neither to do too little, nor to attempt too much.”

Truly, then, may it be said, that, in these cases, no rule can be laid down!

It is in this state of Theology that the trumpet sounds, and the Church is called to do battle with the Sceptics:—

“That Scripture has one meaning and one meaning only, is their fundamental axiom; it is seen to be and felt to be

\* *Ibid.*, p. 386. † *The Beginning of the Book of Genesis*, p. 37.

‡ *Bampton Lectures*, p. 229, 236.



one of the keys of their position.”—“You\* cannot arrest discussion. You must fight!”

Well, then, where are the weapons? What is left but individual judgment, or pure negations? The Church has no theory of Inspiration to offer: no explanation of the nature of Inspiration: no principles by which to determine its extent: no knowledge of the relation between the Divine and human elements: no rules for the ascertainment and interpretation of types: no rules for determining the spiritual sense, thus none for determining what are mere applications, and what are genuine expositions: all this indefiniteness being justified upon the principle, that, as Christ is the Interpreter of His own Word, and as He interprets by His Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit by the Church, and the Church by the consent of the Fathers, and the Fathers have no definite rules of interpretation; so it is the *safest* course for the Church to remain without them, and to caution private judgment against defining that which the Church has left indefinite, or seeking a positive Theology where the Church has sanctioned only negations. And now remember the words, “You cannot arrest discussion. You must fight!”—Surely, it is high time to awake out of sleep:

“It† is, at any rate, a time when religious questions are being sifted with an apparatus of knowledge, and with faculties and a temper of mind, seldom, if ever, before brought to bear upon them. The entire creation of new departments of knowledge, such as philology; the discovery as of things

\* *Defence* of Dr. Williams, p. 324.

† *Replies to Essays and Reviews*, p. 349.

before absolutely unknown, of the physical history of the globe; the rising from the grave, as it were, of whole periods of history contemporary with the Bible, through newly found or newly interpreted monuments; the science of manuscripts, and of settling texts,—all these and many more that might be named, embrace in themselves a whole universe of knowledge bearing upon religion, and especially upon the Bible, to which our fathers were utter strangers. And beyond all these is *the change in the spirit of thought itself*, equally great and equally appropriate to the conditions of the present conflict: the transformation of history by the critical weighing of evidence, by the separation from it of the subjective and the mythical, by the treatment of it in a living and real way; the advance in Biblical criticism which has undoubtedly arisen from the more thorough application to the Bible of the laws of human criticism (the honey out of the lion's carcase); *the temper of mind in dealing with the supernatural*, which habits of experimental science and enlarged physical knowledge have engendered; and above all, *the entire change in the point of view from which men regard all subjects*, from the outward to the inward, from the historical to the metaphysical, from the sensuous to the transcendental, from the common sense of last century to the theories of the Absolute and the Infinite which occupy the attention of the present."

All this awakened spirit of enquiry, this newly-discovered apparatus of knowledge, this change in the very spirit of thought itself, all, we are told, is marching onward in the cause of Scepticism. If you tell us, say the sceptics, that the Scriptures are divinely inspired, and that this Inspiration consists in the spiritual sense, you must tell us what that spiritual sense is, and how we are to arrive at it,—“You cannot arrest discussion, you must fight.”

If, now, according to some, a more important controversy than this has not engaged the attention of the Church for three hundred years, nay, according to others, ever since the Council of Nice; it is our imperative duty to "walk about Zion, and to go round about her, and tell the towers thereof, and mark well her bulwarks," and point out and strengthen the weak and defenceless places which seem almost to invite the presence of the invader.

It has already been observed, that, in consequence of the parallel between the living Word of God and the written Word of God, the difficulties which occur in regard to the *union* of the Divine and human in the one case, have their corresponding difficulties with regard to this *union* in the other; thus, that difficulties with regard to the Divine and human elements in the written Word, point to prior and corresponding difficulties in regard to the Divine and human natures in the living Word. The case is thus stated by a very eminent theologian of the present day :\*—

"As in the case of the Incarnate Word, we fully recognize in the Lord's humanity all essentially human limitations and weaknesses, the hunger, the thirst, and the weariness on the side of the body, and the gradual development on the side of the human mind (Luke ii. 40),—in a word, all that belongs to the essential and original characteristics of the pure form of the nature He vouchsafed to assume, but plainly deny the existence therein of the faintest trace of sin, or of moral or mental imperfections,—even so in the case of the written Word, *viewed on its purely human side, and in its reference to*

\* *Aids to Faith*, p. 417.

*matters previously admitted to have no bearing on Divine truth, we may admit therein the existence of such incompleteness, such limitations, and such imperfections, as belong even to the highest forms of purely truthful human testimony, but consistently deny the existence of mistaken views, perversion, misrepresentation, and any form whatever of consciously committed error or inaccuracy."*

Now, when the written Word is viewed on its *purely human side*, and in reference to matters admitted to have *no bearing upon Divine truth*, what is this but regarding the human as having no relation to the Divine? Whether in this case the human element be true or untrue, fallible or infallible, is not the question. Supposing it to be as perfectly true and infallible as Euclid's *Elements of Geometry*, it is not therefore Divine; for it is admitted to have no bearing upon Divine truth. What now are those parts of the Word of God which are admitted to have no bearing upon Divine truth? Is not the answer the one given by Bishop Tomline as to the Old Testament?—"It\* is not necessary to be able to distinguish the inspired from the uninspired parts of the historical books of the Old Testament."—What can this mean, but that in the historical books of the Old Testament there are occasions on which the human element is not united with the Divine; and that it is nothing to us to what extent that disunion exists?—which is the very argument of the sceptics.

But has not this a correspondence in the relation of the Divine and human natures in the Person of our Lord? There exists, we are told, a *purely human*

\* *Defence of Dr. Williams*, p. 164.

aspect of many things which are recorded of Him ; hunger, thirst, weariness, with all the other limitations and weaknesses belonging to the *purely human* aspect in His character. Regarded as *purely human*, that is, without any union with the Divine, of course they are disunited from the Divine. To what extent does this disunion exist ? Shall we say that it is a question that does not concern us, and into which we ought not to enquire ? that, as in the case of the written Word so in that of the living Word, it is not necessary that all our Lord's actions and sayings should have within them anything Divine ? and that it rests with the good sense, and judgment, and prudence, and so forth, of the expositor to tell us what is Divine and what is not ?

Can it be wondered at, that there are those who infinitely prefer, in this case, the theology of Swedenborg ; according to which, the relation between the Divine and human natures of our Lord was never suspended for a moment ; He never said and never did, no, nor ever suffered anything, in which his human nature was absolutely separated from the Divine ? The Word was made man, and never for a moment was humanity disunited from the Word, or the Incarnation suspended. All the temptations, and hunger, and thirst, and weariness, and weeping, and sighing, and groaning, nay, even the very process of dying were not so many manifestations of the severance only of the human from the Divine, but so many means also of more closely uniting the human with the Divine ; nay, the very process of dying was only a process by which the humanity perfected its union

with the Divinity, and thus took to itself the Divine power of raising itself from the dead, and exercising all power in heaven and in earth.

This is the doctrine of Swedenborg. The humanity became glorified by the very means which seemed most to debase it; and the union between the Divinity and Humanity is now so inseparable, that the *humanity* must be called *Divine*, Immanuel, God with us. The whole controversy, therefore, concerning the Inspiration of the written Word of God, resolves itself into the question of the union of the Human with the Divine, both in the living Word and in the written.

What is the nature of this union? The Church answers, "We have no theory upon the subject." But the Church has said also, We have no theory of Inspiration; and what is the consequence? It is left to the sceptics to provide one. So in regard to the union of the Divine and human natures, the Church has no theory. What is the consequence? The sceptics equally provide one in this case also. But why has the Church no theory? Simply because she has departed from those principles of the union of the human with the Divine, which she once taught as sacred and inviolable. The following represents the present state of Theology upon this subject, as maintained by a very competent Theologian :\*—

"The truth seems to be, that the two elements (the Divine and human) coexist in the same book : they are distinct, but not separable : they are united, but not confused. We can-

\* *The Authority of the New Testament, etc.*, by C. A. Swainson, M.A. Page 147.

not comprehend their *union*, because we want the requisite powers of intellect and of reason: we cannot explain it, because we have nothing like it."

Nothing like it! If so, undoubtedly we cannot explain it;—and then how stands the case?

The *union* is incomprehensible, but the *disunion* is not. A theology founded upon the union must in like manner be incomprehensible; but a theology founded upon the disunion, very plain and practical. Nay: but it is replied, 'A theology founded upon the disunion would be intrinsically false.' Undoubtedly; but it is not admitted to be a disunion; because two natures which to our apprehension are disunited, are nevertheless united in some way beyond our apprehension. Be it so: but what is this but saying, that the only theology suited to our apprehension is the one founded upon disunion? In this case, the union becomes a mere theoretical or speculative subject; and to contemplate the union at all is merely to indulge in theories or speculations: the Church has no theory of the union of the Divinity and Humanity in the person of Christ. Suppose, however, we were to speak of the *disunion* in the same terms in which we speak of the *union*, and say: 'We cannot comprehend the *disunion* because we want the requisite powers of intellect: we cannot explain it, because we have nothing like it.' In this case, would not the whole doctrine of the Incarnation cease to be practically a part of Christianity? If then the *union* of the two natures, not the *disunion*, be altogether past our comprehension, the only possible way in which we can entertain any

---

positive doctrine upon the Incarnation, must be founded upon a disunion of the two natures ; which is the prevalent theology.

And yet how does this harmonize with the Athanasian Creed ? "For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ?" Surely the union of the Divine and human natures in Christ, is here likened to the union of soul and body ; and in like manner, it is a common observation in the Patristic writings, that the Divine element of Scripture is the *soul* and the human the *body*. Thus we see a principle of analogy at once established ; and we may reason from it in regard to the union of the Divine and human in both cases, as we do from analogy in regard to the attributes of God.

In this case, to say that we do not know where the Divine element ends and the human begins, is the same as to say, we do not know where the soul ends and the body begins ; as if the soul and body were continuous quantities, and we could not define the point where they were joined on the one to the other—which would be rather to have a false idea of the nature of the union, than to have no idea whatever.

The advantage, then, of analogy in the present case is, that it furnishes us with a true idea of union ; while without analogy of some kind no such idea is attainable, and if we think upon the subject at all, it must be upon a principle of disunion, or, so to speak, misunion.

We see an exemplification of these remarks in the



doctrine of the Trinity. It has been maintained by a distinguished prelate, that, in this doctrine, divines have made the Unity the incomprehensible mystery. 'We cannot comprehend the union of three Persons in one God,' say many, 'because we want the requisite powers of intellect and of reason: we cannot explain it, because we have nothing like it.' And yet in the doctrine of the Trinity, the Unity cannot be ignored without the necessary consequence of Tritheism. In like manner, in the doctrine of the Incarnation, the union of the two natures cannot be ignored without the necessary consequence of Nestorianism. Shall unity be ignored in the one case, and yet not in the other, without injury to Theology? And is it not virtually ignored, if, while the disunion is a subject plain and practical, the union is altogether incomprehensible?

But is not the union between the Divine and human natures likened also to a MARRIAGE? Surely the Fathers made use of this analogy: indeed it is noticed by Dean Trench,\* in his explanation of the Parable concerning "The Marriage of the King's Son;" where he speaks of both Augustin and Gregory the Great, as understanding this *marriage* to be one between the Divine Word and the human nature; God and man united, and making one Christ; from which flows the marriage union of Christ with His Church; so that if there were no union between the Divine and human natures, neither would there be any between Christ and His Church. Gregory shews how the two are related—*In hoc Pater regi Filio*

\* *Notes on the Parables*, Eighth Edition, p. 215.

*nuptias fecit, quo ei per Incarnationis mysterium sanctam Ecclesiam sociavit.* Moreover,

Athanasius says,\* "He *deified* that which he put on." "Being God, He has taken to Him the flesh, and being in the flesh, makes the flesh God." "Now the flesh had risen, and put off its mortality, and become God."—"The Word of God did not receive by grace the title of God; but his flesh with Him was accounted God." . . . "And this same God became flesh, that his flesh might become God, Word."—So Gregory of Nazianzum: "God went forth with that which he had taken (the Humanity), one (*en*) of the two contraries, flesh and Spirit, of which the one *deified*, the other was *deified*."—So Gregory Nyssen: "We say that the body too, whereby He took upon Him the suffering, being contempered with the Divine nature, was, through contempering, made that which the nature assuming it, is. So far are we from thinking anything poor of God, the Only-Begotten; for the lower nature, which was taken in that dispensation of love to man, this too we believe to have been transformed to the Divine and pure nature." "He (St. John) knew that the Word which was made flesh, was the same with the Word who was with God. But the flesh is not the same with the Godhead, before it too is transformed to Deity."—So St. Ambrose:

\* These authorities are to be found in a note to Dr. Pusey's Sermon entitled *The Ascension our Glory and Joy*. I have omitted some of them for the sake of brevity: the reader is therefore referred to the Sermon itself, as also to other testimonies upon the same subject, adduced in *The Spiritual Exposition of the Apocalypse*, by the Rev. A. Clissold.

"Then did the Virgin conceive in the womb, and the Word was made flesh that the flesh, might become God."—So Vigilius: "God was so made man, and man made God, that yet neither was absorbed."

Such is the closeness of the union between the Divine and human natures, as stated by some of the ancient writers.

Cornelius a Lapide, in his *Prolegomena* to the *Canticles*, describes it expressly as a *marriage union*. Thus:—

"Christ in his Incarnation entered as it were into a two-fold *marriage*; the first physical, with his *humanity*, which He physically and really united to Himself; the second ethical with the Church, and with all human nature, which He conjoined to Himself by the *humanity* assumed by Himself: the latter marriage follows from the first. For inasmuch as Christ conjoined (*copulavit*) his humanity to Himself, and as it were *espoused* it; hence both in it and by it, He in like manner espoused to Himself all human nature and the Church. For He therefore assumed the *humanity*, in order that by it He might conjoin and bind to Himself, as his members as it were, all mankind and all the faithful; and that He might be their head and chief; their head, I say, as homogeneous with them, *i. e.*, of the same genus and nature with man. In the first *marriage* Christ is the Bridegroom; the Bride is the *humanity* assumed by Christ, to which therefore may be applied, in the first and proper sense, all that in the *Canticles* is said concerning the Bride: in the latter marriage the Bridegroom is Christ, the Bride is the Church; the latter is the end and bound of the former; for the end of the incarnation of the Word was, in the counsel of God, the institution and sanctification of the Church: wherefore, the incarnation of the Word is included and presupposed

in the institution of the Church, just as the means are included in the end, and as it were the cause in the effect."

Sufficient is here said to shew, what is the doctrine of the Catholic Church concerning the *marriage union* between the Divine and human natures in the person of our Lord. It is true that the consummation of this union is represented by some as having been effected at the Incarnation; by others, however, as having been completed at the Ascension. This is the view adopted by Swedenborg, and it further harmonizes with the sentiments of a distinguished modern divine,\* who thus remarks in his Sermon on the *Ascension*:—

"So in-oned is It (viz., the human form) with God, that as God, through taking our flesh, became incarnate, the Manhood, being taken into God, is *deified*. One God is that which *deifies*, and that which is *deified*. God became Man, taking into Him body and soul and mind; and the body, soul, and the mind of the Man, Christ Jesus, are, by union with the Godhead, God. Yet in that unutterable glory He is, and shall be for ever, Man."

It is obvious from these remarks, that the unity is first of the natures, and thence of the whole Person. What is here called a *deified* Humanity, is by Swedenborg called, as indeed Augustin calls it, a *Divine Humanity*. Virtually the two doctrines are the same. For that which is *deified* hath life in itself, just as that which is Divine: at least we leave others to draw the invisible line of difference between the two. If to *glorify* here means to *deify*, surely to glorify the Humanity is to make it Divine; and if the title

\* Dr. Pusey. See his *Parochial Sermons*, vol. ii., p. 225.

*Word of God* applies to the Divine Nature, it applies in this case to the human ; because the human is Divine, and the Humanity as such, is the Word of God. Thus the title *Word of God* does not apply primarily to the Person as distinguished from the natures, but to the unification of the natures by the glorification of the humanity ; and the whole Person is called *The Word of God*, because the Humanity is made Divine, and as such is in itself the Word of God. It is thus that the Divinity and Humanity, while distinct, are yet distinctly *one*, and constitute one Person, one *Word of God*.

But what concord is there between this doctrine, and that of modern Theology ? For according to this Theology, the two natures, the Divine and the human, coexist in one Person, and the oneness of the Person gives unity to the natures : the two natures are said to be united, because the Person is one : whereas, according to the foregoing doctrine, there is a union of the natures which causes the Person to be undivided. For if Nestorianism divides the natures and thereby originates two Persons, then the doctrine which unites the natures imparts also unity to the whole Person. In the popular doctrine the unity is predicated of the Person, not of the natures ; there are really two disunited natures in one Person, so that in fact the very individuality of the Person is itself destroyed. Now, if the union between the Divine and human natures be destroyed, and if that union be nevertheless a *marriage union* ; it is obvious, that in this case *the very Divine marriage itself is destroyed*, and consequently the very

first source of the marriage union between Christ and His Church, consequently also between husband and wife upon earth. It is fatal to Christianity, fatal to society, to call this a speculative subject: it is the most practical the Church can entertain.

‘Nay,’ it will be replied; ‘*Marriage* is here only a figurative expression; and you cannot found an argument upon a figure.’—Suppose then you call it a figure, and say that the marriage is metaphorical, and that metaphor has no corresponding reality; what are you maintaining? That the marriage of Christ with His Church has no basis in any corresponding *reality*: and what right have you to complain after this, if marriage upon earth be regarded as a mere civil contract, or a social hypothesis? How can any one maintain the sanctity of marriage, who destroys the very first principles of its sanctity? We say, then, that in this case *marriage* is a reality, not a figure: it is not a metaphor, but a real analogy; and analogies may be used as the basis of argument. “Analogies,” says a modern writer, “are founded on the relations between the natural and spiritual worlds, therefore they are something more than illustrations:”—“they are arguments, and may be alleged as witnesses.”

Now if the Lord be the living Word of God, and in His person there is a *marriage* of the Divine and Human natures; and if there is a close analogy between the living and the written Word; shall we not say, that in the written Word of God there is a corresponding union of the Divine and human elements? That to contemplate either one as *separate*

from the other is to divorce the two : to destroy, as far as in us lies, the *marriage union* between the Divine and human elements in the written Word? Either this is true, or else it is untrue that there is any strict analogy between the living Word and the written Word. Now if the written Word treat entirely of the living Word, and in the living Word exists the marriage union between the Divine and human natures, it amounts to a self-contradiction to say there are no traces of this union in the written Word ; and if such traces are to be found, what shall we say of any interpretation and criticism which ignore them? This is no case of Mysticism : it is a case of logical sequence of principles.

If there be a marriage union between the Divine and human natures in the living Word : hence a marriage union between the Lord and His Church : then, if the analogy between the living Word and the written Word be so close, that the only difference between the two is that the one is living and the other written ; it follows, that there is in the written Word of God a marriage union of the Divine and human elements ; and the written Word will exhibit evidences of that union. The premises are absolutely false, or the conclusion is absolutely true. As long as the nature of the union between the Divinity and Humanity in our Lord is utterly unknown, and regarded as inexplicable by any analogy : as long as that union and the process by which it was perfected, cease to be recognized, as they have ceased : as long as the expression *Word of God*, applied to certain Scriptures, is an expression without any definite meaning ;

so long must the original doctrine held by the Catholic Church, of a marriage union between the Divine and human natures of our Lord, naturally fall into contempt as a mere mystical vagary; but as this is the foundation of the marriage union of the Lord with the Church, of course this union disappears with it; the foundation being destroyed, the superstructure falls; and in this case, what becomes of the Church?

I say, then, supposing this union to exist in the written Word, that Word, as Divinely inspired, will exhibit evidences of its existence; and it would be an unaccountable oversight in any interpreter, to ignore these evidences in his interpretations of Scripture. Accordingly, what has Swedenborg said upon this subject? Let us give him a fair hearing. He says:\*

“It is usual in the Word, especially in the prophetic, to express one thing twice, only changing the expression. He who is unacquainted with the mystery involved in this circumstance, may suppose that it is a needless repetition. Nevertheless, this is not the case; but one expression relates to good, the other to truth; and whereas good is of the will, and truth is of the understanding, one hath relation to the will, the other to the understanding; the reason is, because in the Word every thing is holy, and *its holiness is from the heavenly marriage*, which is that of good and truth. Hence it is that heaven is in the Word, consequently the Lord, who is the all in

\* *Arcana Coelestia*, 5502. See also *The Doctrine of the New Jerusalem concerning the Sacred Scripture*, art. 84.



all of heaven ; so that the Lord is the Word. The two names of the Lord, viz., *Jesus Christ*, involve the same ; the name *Jesus* implying the *Divine good* ; and the name *Christ* the *Divine truth*. Hence also it is evident, that the Lord is in all things of the Word, insomuch that He is the Word itself. Hence also it may be evidently concluded, that man, if he expects heaven, must not only be in the truth which is of faith, but also in the good which is of charity ; and that otherwise there is no heaven in him."

Thus what might appear to some to be a wild phantasy in the mind of Swedenborg, is founded upon the deepest reasons derived from the marriage union of good and truth in every part of the Word of God ; that is to say, the union between the Lord and His Church ; so that in an interpretation conducted upon this principle, the human element is *never* disunited from the Divine ; for, wherever this disunion takes place, there Divine Inspiration ceases, there the writing ceases to be the Word of God. "No man hath seen God at any time : the only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him" (ἐξηγήσατο). The Word made flesh is the *exegesis* of the Divinity ; the Word made writing is the *exegesis* of the Divine Wisdom. The true *exegesis* therefore of the written Word is the declaration, bringing forth, or manifestation, of the Divine element in the human. If there were no divine element within the human, there could be no spiritual interpretation ; genuine spiritual interpretation being only the *exegesis* of this divine element in the human, suitably to our several states and capabilities of appre-

hension. Deny the Divine element in the human wherever you may, and spiritual interpretation will be regarded as an importation of meanings into Scripture, rather than an elicitation of meaning from out of it; for certainly we can never bring out of the written Word, that which was never in.

No one, however, can fail to see, that throughout this argument we have been taking the phrase *Word of God* in a much stricter sense than the one in which it is generally understood. Relax the meaning of the expression, and you relax the *union* between the Divine and human elements: you relax the union between the Divine and human natures: you relax the *marriage union* between Christ and his Church; "the marriage of the Lamb" no longer exists. Therefore, as the acknowledgment of the union of the Divine and human natures, is alone that in virtue of which there is a relation between the Divine and human elements in the written Word, and thence of the Lord to the Church; so the Church comes into a perception of this relation, in proportion as she comes into the perception and thence acknowledgment of the spiritual sense of the Word; for that spiritual sense is based upon this union, and is the revelation by the Lord of Himself to the Church: it is the revelation of Himself to the Seven Churches or to the whole Catholic Church; a revelation which culminates as it were in this announcement, "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to him; for the *marriage* of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready."

We thus see the *origin* of the uncertainty of the

rules with regard to spiritual interpretation ; and why it is that not only no certain rule exists, but that none can exist, consistently with the state of modern Theology. Without any fixed principles of *union* between the Divine and human elements; without any perception of the nature, laws, and extent of that union, the whole question of Inspiration and Interpretation, becomes a mere matter of opinion, involved in doubts, difficulties, conjectures, confusion, and contradiction. No rules can be laid down for anything ; and we can fully appreciate the remarks of Mr. Conybeare when speaking of the *Liber Regularum* by Tychonius :\*—

“ We may be permitted perhaps to regret, that none of the earlier and more learned Fathers of the Church should have left us any more specific and systematic enumeration of the laws and principles by which they were guided in their invention, and application of allegorical expositions ; but in this deficiency, it would scarcely repay the labor, if indeed it were practicable within the limits of these discourses, to enter upon the details of *a subject so full of intricacy and uncertainty.*”

Now what are the consequences of this uncertain and unsettled state of Theology ? The alternative is either to go into a Church, the authority of which overrules all difficulties ; or else to leave the questions of Inspiration and Interpretation open to interminable controversy. In this case, suppose the overruling authority of the Church of Rome should be preferred : what says Dr. Van Mildert ?†—

\* Conybeare's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 187.

† See his *Bampton Lectures*, p. 72.

“Whatever be the authority that assumes a power to determine, *suo jure*, the sense of Scripture, or to impose articles of belief derived from any other source; that authority itself, if its right be admitted, becomes the Rule of Faith, and virtually supersedes the other.”

The Church in this case supersedes the Word of God, and there is an end of the matter. On the other hand, what are the consequences of leaving open the questions of Inspiration and Interpretation, without any fixed principles by which to decide them? An interminable controversy as to what is the Word of God, and what is not;—

“My\* Lord, I admit that the phrase ‘*the Word of God*’ as applied to the Bible, is a valuable and instructive expression; an expression which is of the highest authority, and is used in the Articles of the Church of England; but I deny that it is a dogmatic expression, or has any dogmatic bearing whatever; because it is impossible to say what the dogma is which it is meant to lay down. What is the meaning of the expression, ‘The Bible is *the Word of God*?’ Does it imply the absolute infallibility of the Scripture? If it does not, where do you stop?”

Yes, what is the meaning of the expression, the Bible is the Word of God? This is the question for the Church to determine: not merely whether it means *pars pro toto*; or Scripture in so far as it is the Word of God; but what is the meaning of the expression *Word of God* itself? If applied to the written Word in an inferior sense, why not to the living Word in an inferior sense? for the only difference between the two is, that the one is the

\* *Defence of Dr. Williams*, p. 193.

living Word, the other the written. It may be denied, that the title *Word of God* is applicable to certain Scriptures in the strict sense of the terms; but still if it be conceded that it is applicable, the Scriptures cannot be fallible in the sense in which they are Divine.

It may be said: The fallibility is not of the Divine element, but of the human. I answer: If the human element contain within it the Divine, it is part of the Word of God; and in this sense is it not infallible? If it does not contain within it the Divine, it forms no part of the Word of God; and if it forms no part of the Word of God, whether it be fallible or infallible is beside the question.

Moreover, if the human element of the written Word in its union with the Divine be fallible, are we to admit that the human nature in the living Word is also fallible? It is asserted by some, that the 110th Psalm was not written by David; that the common view taken by the Jews, that David was the writer of it, is a mistake;\* "that there is no ground for denying that Jesus shared the common view, and never doubted that the heading of the Psalm was correct; as a historical and critical question of this sort could be entertained only in the sphere of his individual human culture, which would necessarily bear the stamp of his age and country." And yet they who maintain this opinion, maintain also the Divine character of our Lord: it is the human only that is said to be fallible. When therefore

\* *A Brief Examination of prevalent opinions on Inspiration.* By a Layman. Page 17.

our Lord is called the 'Word made flesh,' does it imply the fallibility of the human nature? If it does, where do you stop? Shall it be said that the Church has no theory upon the subject? That she does not presume to define the "*proportion*" between the Divine and human elements? If she does not, the very meaning of the phrase *Word of God* becomes an open question: it may imply sometimes what is Divine, sometimes what is only human; and consequently cease to imply necessarily the Divinity of that of which it is predicated.

Accordingly, the phrase *Word of God* is denied to be dogmatic. As applied to the living Word it is generally acknowledged to be dogmatic: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," is a passage acknowledged to be a proof of the Divinity of the Word. It may be asked then; If the expression be dogmatic as applied to the living Word, why not as applied to the written Word? The answer is evident: The phrase *Word of God* is admitted to be dogmatic as applied to the Divine nature, but not as applied to the human: indeed, strictly speaking, it is not regarded as properly applicable to the human nature at all. For the *Word of God* implies the wisdom of God; the wisdom of God is Divine; but the human nature, as we have seen, is not regarded as Divine. Hence, if the title *Word of God* be applied to the human nature, it is applied in a different sense; and if we once admit that there is a sense in which it does not imply Divinity, "it is impossible to say what the dogma is which it is meant to lay down."

The same is the case with regard to the written Word. If we call certain Scriptures *the Word of God*, and if notwithstanding there are parts of these Scriptures which contain *no* Divine element, we can regard them as such only in an inferior sense; and thus the title *Word of God*, ceasing to imply necessarily Divine Wisdom, ceases also in this respect to be dogmatic.

Who then has any right to complain of the Church, if, under such circumstances, it has really made the relation between the Divine and human elements an open question? For in this case, the Church does not undertake to deny that there are instances (and these not a few) in which there is *no union whatever* between the Divine and human elements; indeed it is most instructive to see how both Sceptical and Orthodox writers harmonize with each other in this respect.

Let the first example be taken from reputedly Sceptical writers:—

“The\* human and the Divine are united in it, in a similar manner as the human body is with the spirit of which it is the instrument: the two elements are closely associated, and it would be like treating a living organism as a *corpsé*, if we should seek mechanically to *sever* the one from the other.”

The same writer had previously observed:—

“Hence the Scripture can only be regarded and treated as the Word of God, on condition that it shall be interpreted

\* *Brief Examination of Prevalent Opinions on Inspiration, etc.*, pp. 235, 234.

with the key of an enlightened conscience ; that in this way all that is *human* in it shall be *separated* from what is *divine*, and that the kernel of salvation shall be discriminated from its mundane husk."

How then are you to arrive at the Divine element? According to this account, by *separating* from it the Human: for "the human and imperfect individuality of the writers cleaves to the Scripture; and to assert that this individuality was the Word of God, would be more than an error, it would be a *sin*." Well, then, how do we arrive at the soul? By parity of reason, by *separating* from it the body. But in this case the body dies. In order to know what Moses and the prophets mean, therefore, you must first kill them; and this seems to be very much the way in which the Jews acted toward our Saviour, in order to put it to the test whether He were the Messiah or not.

Let us next proceed to the nonsceptical writers.

Baxter\* admitted that the *sense* is the soul of Scripture, and the *letters* but the body or vehicle. He calls the Scriptures the Word of God; but, says he—

... "All parts are not of equal necessity or weight; and as many err by casting off the Old Testament, so others err by equalling it to us with the New." . . . "We have great cause to take heed of overvaluing its use to us, lest we contradict Paul, that saith that even that which was written in stone is done away, and the law changed, with the priesthood and the old faulty covenant, for a better, of which see the first nine chapters to the Hebrews."

\* *Defence of Dr. Williams*, pp. 129, 132, 133.



Hence he proceeds to say, that the revelation to David was comparatively obscure; that of the lies, polygamy, divorces, blood-shedding, of which we read respectively in the history of David, Solomon, and the Israelites in general, God does not approve; nor of the curses which fill the Psalms of David.—“So that he says distinctly,—that many of David’s Psalms are unchristian; and unchristian, because, though an inspired man, his inspiration did not protect him from every description of crime in his life, or from many most serious errors in his writings.”

A plain instance in which the human is separated from the Divine.

To refer to a more orthodox school: does this never separate the human from the Divine? How can it? ‘The Old Testament,’ it assures us, ‘has *not* passed away: it is divinely inspired: it is the Word of God: it consists accordingly of two elements, the Divine and the human: these two are *inseparable*; still you must not confound the one with the other, but carefully distinguish between the two.’—Be it so: but now observe the qualifications.\* ‘We have little to do with criticising the characters and imperfections of the men whom God used as his instruments in conveying to us the knowledge of His will; for, as Butler says, . . . our only enquiry should be, Did the message come from him?’ Elijah was a man of like passions as we are. Blot out from the Old Testament the signs of his imperfection, his desponding journey to Mount Horeb, and the wish for himself that he

\* *The Authority of the New Testament, etc.* By C. A. Swainson M.A. Page 86 and seq.

might die, and where are then the proofs of his humanity?

Take the case of Moses: turn to the human side of the picture: he was a man of like passions as we are. He slew the Egyptian who was contending with the Hebrew: how sorely, too, was he tried by the Israelites! Are you surprised that he fell at last before the continued murmuring of the people? that he smote the rock in anger; and being sometimes wroth, was not allowed to enter into the land of Canaan? Here we have the human elements of his character.

Take another case: Abraham was guilty of equivocation when requesting Sarah to tell Abimelech that she was his sister; shewing that, after all his communion with God, he retained the imperfections of human nature; and was a man of like passions with ourselves.

In these and other similar passages of Scripture, such, we are told, is the human element: where is the Divine? Answer:—‘In the message they delivered. We really have nothing to do with the general character of the instruments used, except so far as it affects their credibility.’ What is this but a repetition of the principles advocated by Baxter? The distinction of the human element from the Divine is here evidently a *separation*: there is no Divine element whatever in the human: it is simply and singly human imperfection: for, if any Divine element had been retained, it would have been upon this principle, that God could make use of the imperfections of his servants, as well as of their perfections, for conveying to mankind the Divine Truth of

his Word ; which is the principle adopted by Swedenborg. Here however nothing of the kind is intimated. The imperfections are human imperfections, and nothing more : and in what respect does this method of Interpretation differ from that of the Sceptical Theologian ?—who says—

I also affirm that Scripture,\* as the Word of God, must be “interpreted with the key of an enlightened conscience ; that in this way all that is human in it shall be *separated* from what is Divine, and that the kernel of salvation shall be discriminated from the mundane husk.” . . Thus—“ If we recognize in Scripture a *human* as well as a *Divine* side ; if we regard the *latter* as concerned only with spiritual truth, while we refer to the former all that is demonstrably erroneous, or morally imperfect, all scientific inaccuracies, and all historical discrepancies, we shall avoid the doubts and perplexities which must necessarily arise, so long as we attempt to deal with these embarrassing elements as if they were portions of a Book which was from beginning to end the Word of God.”

The *separation* of the human element from the Divine is, we are told, a *duty* ; and not to make this separation, is a *sin* ; for a large portion of the human element contains nothing Divine, and as such to call it Divine, would be to deify human frailties : it has no claim whatever to the title *the Word of God*. The proper figure of rhetoric therefore by which the Scriptures may nevertheless be called *the Word of God*, is *synecdoche* ; in virtue of which we may call the whole the Word of God, when we do

\* *A Brief Examination of Prevalent Opinions on Inspiration*, by a Layman, pp. 234, 248.

not believe the whole to be so, but only a part.—“It may mean Scripture in so far as it is the Word of God.”—Thus we may strike out an indefinite portion from the Law, the Psalms, the Prophets, the Gospels, nay, even the Apocalypse, for this might be shewn to be a book of poetry.\*

“What do they mean,” says a voice in the Court of Arches, “when they say that you are to believe that the Bible is the Word of God? Do they mean to say that you must believe every word—IN WHAT? In the Bible? And what is the Bible? Is it the authorized version? And if not, how otherwise? Do they mean to say that every word in the authorized version is of Divine authority? If they do not, what do they mean? They are pleading upon a metaphor—they have introduced a metaphor into the indictment; and they say, because you have used language which is inconsistent with this *metaphor*, therefore you are a heretic.”

Well then, what is the Bible?

“The† sixty-six books are partly history, partly poetry, partly moral treatises: they contain, probably, at least one drama: they contain many prophecies, whatever may be the sense of the word prophecy. They are written in an Eastern language, absolutely *saturated* with figure, metaphor, and allusion. The history contains some poetry, and the poetry and prophecy contain much history. Isaiah is poetical, but it contains much historical matter. The book of Exodus is as unquestionably historical; yet it contains the song of Deborah. Now to believe in a history is one thing, to believe in a poem is another.”

“*Dean of the Arches.*—In what?

“*Mr. Stephen.*—To believe in a poem. The assertion, ‘I believe in Gibbon’s *History* conveys one idea;’ the assertion,

\* *Defence of Dr. Williams*, pp. 40, 192.

† *Ibid.*, p. 54.

‘I believe in Virgil’s *Æneid*,’ conveys quite a different idea,” etc., etc. •

Is there nothing ominous of the future of the Church, in the array of authorities by which this view of the subject is supported? Well might the Advocate remark:—“The Church of England cannot altogether abjure reason—it cannot decline discussion upon these subjects—it cannot assume the position of the Church of Rome, and rely upon its own infallible authority; and until *every one of the passages which I read yesterday is erased from the writings of its most eminent divines*, it can as little rely upon the absolute infallibility of the Bible. Therefore controversy there must be. What will follow? Are you to place the Church in the most contemptible of all positions?” etc., etc.

No! but if we fight, it must be under the banner of One who has been wounded in the house of His friends: whose garments have been stained with blood; but who still bears the name of the Word of God, and out of whose mouth proceedeth a sharp sword wherewith to smite the armies of falsities.

For is it not clear, that, in statements of this kind, the opponents of the Church, if they are so to be called, are fighting the Church with its own weapons? That metaphor on the one side is employed to meet metaphor on the other? Has not the Church itself armed them, and enabled them to retort upon itself its own method of Interpretation?—As with Metaphor, so with *Ideology*.—“The question is simply this,” says a writer:\* “Are the same principles ap-

\* *Aids to Faith*, p. 140.

plicable to secular history, and to the records of a scheme which is professedly one of Divine interpositions? We see perfectly well, that, if they were applicable, the conclusions of the Ideologist could scarcely be controverted.”—In answer to this, we ask a corresponding question: “Are the same principles applicable to secular poetry, and Scripture prophecies?” If they are, the conclusions of the Sceptic can scarcely be controverted. If sacred and secular poetry be interpreted upon the same principles, why not sacred and secular history? Have not theologians, by the metaphorical system, paved the way for that of Ideology? If the truth of God be subverted, it is no matter whether it be by Metaphor or Ideology. One of the reputed Ideologists has made a large use of the figurative system:† the very term *Inspiration* is said to be figurative; there is metaphor in the terms *propitiation* and *sacrifice*:—the expressions, *This is my body*—*This is my blood*, are both said to be figurative. Now if metaphor be that figure which has no corresponding reality, and which is proper to the Imagination; Metaphor as truly leads to myth as Ideology; and we may truly say, that, in this respect, Ideology is to history what Metaphor is to prophecy.

Accordingly, those parts of prophecy which are metaphorically interpreted, belong, it is said, to the human element; in which there is nothing Divine because nothing spiritual; and upon this principle Scripture is subjected to a process not of *exegesis*,

† *A brief Examination of Prevalent Opinions on Inspiration.* Introduction by H. B. Wilson, B.D. p. 66, 65.

but of *exinanition* ; you cannot bring out any spiritual sense, because it is interpreted upon a principle which is itself a negation of it ; and the method of Interpretation therefore utterly failing to bring out a spiritual sense, we are told it is not there, and that we ought not to be wise above what is written, or enquire into things which God has not revealed, or entertain any theories concerning the union of the Divine and human elements, and hence concerning Inspiration.

What is the consequence ? That the Divine and human elements are both ultimately dispensed with : the Divine is too high to be comprehended ; the human too low to be respected, too antiquated to be retained, or too fallible to be trusted.

The same consequences of the same method of Interpretation we see exemplified in the very doctrines of Christianity. We are “redeemed” or “ransomed by the blood of Christ : we are “purchased” or “bought with a price :” there is exchange or transfer in some sense or other. It has been popularly represented as a commercial transfer, a transaction between God and Christ. This is the human side of the doctrine ; very plain and practical ! What then is the Divine side ?\*—That which involves “inscrutable and tremendous mysteries,—mysteries which ever have baffled, and must ever baffle all human reason !” This is the doctrine of Bishop Browne : it is that of Dr. Williams. Neither party professes to go beyond the merely human element. Thus the Divine element surpasses comprehension,

\* *Defence of Dr. Williams*, p. 317.

and what is incomprehensible does not affect us. The human element alone remains, separated from the Divine; and as to receive it literally is to misrepresent the truth, and yet we do not understand the higher and spiritual signification of the doctrine, we must have recourse to "inferences," "consequences," and "uses," as the only means by which to avoid misrepresentation, and entertain any rational views of Christianity. For—

"How† can this (misrepresentation) be avoided, except by dwelling upon the *human* side of these doctrines, which are thus capable of misrepresentation; and preferring to speak not of the mode of the Incarnation, but of the *inferences* which we are to draw from the fact; not of God's reason for being propitious to man, but of the *consequences* which man is to draw from the fact that God is propitious to him; not upon the manner in which grace may be communicated in baptism, but upon the *use* which is to be made of it in after life."

Do not, however, the very misrepresentations complained of, result from a contemplation of the human element apart from the Divine? and if, when thus contemplated, the facts are misrepresented, how are we to arrive at a correct idea of the facts? Truth enacted becomes a fact: what is the Grace conferred at baptism is a question of fact: what is the meaning of the term *Propitiation* is only asking, what fact does *propitiation* mean: what fact again does the Incarnation mean: does it, or does it not, mean the fact, that as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ? So finally, what fact

\* *Defence of Dr. Williams*, p. 317.



is meant by the expression, the Bible is the written Word of God? Does it mean, that certain Scriptures are the Word of God in the highest sense of the terms, *i. e.*, Divine; and if so, what is that sense?

“Why\* the Lord is called *the Word*,” says Swedenborg, “is but little understood in the Church. He is however called the Word, because *the Word* signifies Divine Truth, or Divine Wisdom; and the Lord is Divine Truth itself, or Divine Wisdom itself; for which reason He is likewise called the Light, which also is said to have come into the world. Divine Wisdom and Divine Love constitute a one; and were from eternity a one in the Lord; wherefore it is said, ‘In Him was life, and the life was the light of men.’ Life is Divine Love, and Light is Divine Wisdom. This oneness is what is meant by those words, ‘In the beginning the Word was with God, and the Word was God.’ *With God*, means to be in Him; for Wisdom is in Love, and Love in Wisdom. So also in St. John, chap. xvii. 5.”

“That the Word which is here specifically meant, is the same that was manifested by Moses, and the Prophets, and by the Evangelists, may evidently appear from this consideration; that this is Divine Truth itself from which is derived all the wisdom that exists with angels, and all spiritual intelligence with men. For angels have in the heavens the very same Word that men have in the world; save only that with men it is natural, whereas in the heavens it is spiritual. And since the Word is Divine Truth, it is also the Divine Proceeding; and this is not only

\* *Doctrine of the New Jerusalem concerning the Lord*, art. 1.

from the Lord, but is also the Lord Himself. As this Word is thus the Lord Himself, each and all things in the Word are written in reference to Him alone. From Isaiah even to Malachi there is nothing which is not concerning the Lord, or in the opposite sense, contrary to the Lord. That this is the case, has not heretofore been seen by any one; but yet every one may see it, provided he is apprised of it, and thinks of it whilst he is reading; and is informed further, that in the Word there is not only a natural but also a spiritual sense; and that in this sense by the names of persons and of places is signified something concerning the Lord, and thence something concerning heaven and the church from Him, or something opposite thereto. Now as each and all things thereto have reference to the Lord; and as the Word, because it is Divine Truth, is the Lord; it clearly appears why it is said, 'And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory:' and also why it is said, 'While ye have light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light. I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness.' Light is the Divine Truth,—thus the Word: wherefore every one, even at the present day, who, when reading the Word, approaches the Lord alone and prays to Him, is enlightened by it."

In conclusion:—

It is the opinion of many, that a new era is opening upon the whole Christian world. If new errors or new heresies may rise up within the Church; why not new truths, or new forms of truth? "The pro-

mulgation of errors," says Mr. Swainson,\* "will accompany or anticipate the discovery of the truth. And I maintained that when the truth is discovered, there will be possibly a slow, but certainly a sure progress in its reception, *until at length it pervades the Church at large.*"—It is simply absurd to suppose, that when truth is discovered, it is discovered to the whole body of the Catholic Church which all at once receives it, and makes it known in virtue of the sanction given to it by herself. The Catholic Church is too broken up to allow of anything of the kind. The real progress of Truth is seen in its reception first by *individuals*, then by greater numbers, then in the rise of controversies making the truth more widely known, and sifting the evidence with which it is accompanied. Thus the Church as a body is last in the order of reception. But when the Church comes finally to receive it, then has she been taught by the Holy Spirit, who has taken of the things of the Word of God, and shewn them unto the Church. Thus the order in which the Church *receives* Truth, and the order in which she *teaches* Truth, are altogether different. If old received truths are preached by the Church *ex auctoritate*, newly discovered truths are not promulgated in this way; and therefore to reject interpretations of the Word of God simply because they do not come *prima facie* with the stamp of Church authority, is absurd. Indeed, how can Truth receive the sanction of the Church before it is received by the Church? Truth when

\* *The Creeds of the Church.* By C. A. Swainson, M.A. Hulsean Lectures, p. 111.

first made known to individuals by the Holy Spirit, stands outside the Church, knocking at the door until it is received within; and we may be assured that when once received, it gives authority to the Church, not receives authority from her. It is in this way, then, that the Holy Spirit makes known the Truth to the Church, even at the present day. Thus it is that "Christ is the Everlasting Word: He is the Author of the Written Word; He is also the Interpreter of the Bible. He has given us the Scriptures by the Holy Spirit, and that Spirit is in his Church Universal"—authorizing the Church to *receive* as well as to *give*, and disposing the Church to receive in order that it may be enabled to give. Thus it is that "Christ as the Interpreter," in regard to all new interpretations, interprets first of all to individuals, and through individuals to the Church. This is confirmed by Bishop Butler;\*

"The hindrances, too, of natural and of supernatural light and knowledge have been of the same kind. And as it is owned the whole scheme of Scripture is not yet understood, so, if it ever comes to be understood before the Restitution of all things and without miraculous interpositions, it must be in the same way as natural knowledge is come at by the continuance and progress of learning and of liberty, and by *particular persons* attending to, comparing, and pursuing intimations scattered up and down it, which are overlooked and disregarded by the generality of the *world*."

That is to say,—by the generality of the *Church*; because it is the Church, not the world, which holds itself responsible for the interpretation of Scripture.

\* *Analogy*, part 2, chap. 3.

In the present case, what is it that the Church has overlooked and disregarded? Not details, but general principles—principles which involve the question of the nature and extent of Divine Inspiration; a question which the Church has always avoided, and which it is now compelled to meet face to face. “Is it credible,”\* we are asked, “that if the Church had held any broad, intelligible doctrine on the subject of the Inspiration, the criticism, or the Interpretation of the Bible, that declaration should be absent from the Thirty-nine Articles, the three Creeds, and the Catechism?” The principal declaration which is to be found, occurs in the *Homilies*, and is one on which we have founded our present argument. The difficulty in the Church has been to find a definite theory of Inspiration and Interpretation adequate to this view of the subject. It has confessedly found none. Swedenborg has supplied one, based upon the principle of a *spiritual sense*. I have accordingly availed myself of it, and shall continue to do so.

And now comes the popular objection to this species of exposition; which is thus advocated by Dr. Van Mildert in his *Bampton Lectures*: †

“Nor is it a slight objection to the indiscriminate application of this species of exposition, that it renders the Scriptures in general too deep and mysterious for *popular apprehension*. Almost every mystical Expositor aims at novelty. His object is to make *discoveries* in spiritual knowledge. He sets out with the persuasion that a great portion of the Scriptures has hitherto been, as it were, a sealed Book, not fully understood, except by a chosen few gifted with

\* *Defence of Dr. Williams*, p. 63.

† See p. 247.

extraordinary powers to penetrate its interior, and to disclose its precious treasures. He adopts, moreover, a principle which makes it scarcely possible to determine when the whole truth is actually laid before us. For, if so excursive and volatile a faculty as the Imagination be permitted to range *ad libitum* in its airy regions, who shall say when it has arrived at the conclusion of its labors? What errors too in religious opinions may not receive a plausible appearance, by the aid of a mode of Interpretation so lax and flexible in itself, and affording such facilities for a perversion of the truth."

Now the three methods of Interpretation laid down by Dr. Van Mildert are the Literal, the Figurative, and the Mystical. As to the literal, it is at length acknowledged that "the mere literalist can hardly be said to be a believer in Divine Inspiration." As to the figurative, "the prophecies,"\* we are told, "are written in an Eastern language, absolutely saturated with figure, metaphor, and allusion ;"—

"Surely† a large part of the Bible is poetry, and the very essence of poetry is *Imagination*. . . . You‡ may think this (passage) is prose, but I happen to think it is poetry. We both agree that some is poetry and some is prose; but I take my view of it, and you take yours. I think it was meant allegorically, and you think it was meant literally, and there are many authorities on the Bible who take each view. . . . Observe,§ my lord; I do not say that any one is at liberty to understand the Bible in a sense which the authors did not intend. I say he is at liberty to form his own opinion as to what the sense was they did intend, as to what part they intended as poetry, and what as prose, or what as metaphor and what as plain fact."

\* *Defence of Dr. Williams*, p. 54.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

† *Ibid.*, p. 201.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

Shall we take refuge in the Mystical mode of Interpretation? But here we are told the Mystical is so "lax and flexible," that "in determining the extent of this species of Interpretation there is considerable difficulty."—No definite rule accordingly has been laid down: it is left to the discretion of the interpreter.—"Great judgment is necessary, neither to do too little, nor to attempt too much." Thus the rules of Interpretation are undefined, the nature and extent of Inspiration undefined, everything relating to the subject indefinite. Seeing these difficulties with regard to Inspiration, the whole ground has been shifted in the Lectures of Mr. Swainson, at Cambridge, in 1859, from Divine Inspiration to *Apostolical Authority*; but, at Oxford in 1861, it is shifted back again by Mr. Burgon to the original ground of Divine Inspiration; and here stands the question at present, the argument being now, for a time at least, in favor of Mystical or Spiritual Interpretation.

As to the remark, that it is no slight objection to this species of exposition, that it renders the Scriptures in general too deep and mysterious for *popular apprehension*, it must be owned that modern theology is not liable to this charge, and that *too great a depth* is not one of its faults. Nevertheless, in the *Records of an Evangelical Ministry*, occurs the following remark:—

"His sermons were full of matter. Strangers visiting his church would say that he preached over the heads of his people; yet his people themselves said, 'Mr. Phillips goes so deep into things that he makes it all clear to us.' Many after

his death could repeat the substance of long passages from his sermons."

Waters that fail, are never likely to become too deep; but deep waters evidence at least a plentiful supply. There is a great difference between accommodating a truth to popular apprehension, and denying the truth altogether. It may require skill in a preacher to explain to the people a spiritual truth; but it requires none to tell them that he has none to explain; as he eschews all novelties, and all discoveries in spiritual knowledge. The sceptic, we may be assured, will equally with the orthodox literalist eschew spiritual Interpretation, and zealously contend for the literal and figurative systems, thus for one meaning and one meaning only, or almost only; both will equally denounce a double sense of Scripture, until at last the orthodox finds that in his zeal to suit Scripture to popular apprehension, the whole cause of the Word of God has been betrayed into the hands of the sceptic, and then he is warned by the learned and more spiritually-minded of his own Church :\*—

"That he who reads Scripture under the persuasion that it *OFTEN* contains depths not yet sounded, and meanings not yet ascertained, will certainly read it with far greater spiritual profit to himself, than he who believes he has fully arrived at the mind of Scripture when he has made out the mere outward meaning of the letter."

Dean Ellicott here says *often* : Swedenborg says *always* :†—

\* *Aids to Faith*, p. 452.

† *Apocalypse Revealed*, chap. xix., art. 824.



*“And he had a name written that no one knew but he himself,* signifies, that what the Word is in its spiritual and celestial sense, no one sees but the Lord, and they to whom he reveals it. By *name* is signified the quality of any one; in the present case, the quality of the Word, or what the Word is internally, that is, in its spiritual and celestial sense. It is called a *written* name, because the Word exists as well among men upon earth as among angels in heaven. By no one knowing it but himself, is signified that no one sees but the Lord himself, and they to whom he reveals it, what the Word is in its spiritual sense. Thus, no one sees the spiritual sense of the Word but only the Lord; and no one sees that sense but from the Lord; and no one sees it from the Lord, except he be in Divine truths from Him.”

---

## APPENDIX.

Some Reviewers read before they write; others write before they read. Whether the following remarks from the *Christian Remembrancer* are illustrations of the latter course, I leave others to judge:—

*Christian Remembrancer*:—"We may add that no one can doubt from whence came the reveries of Emanuel Swedenborg, and the principles of the strange sect which bears his name. In this system the literal disappears altogether, and nothing but the allegory remains; this spiritual sense, or rather fantastical, is set before us as the only one worthy of notice, the literal being merely the casket that contains it." (*April*, 1862, *art.* Kabbalism, *p.* 379.)

*Swedenborg*:—"In the literal sense of the Word, Divine Truth is in its fulness, sanctity, and power. . . The Word is pre-eminently the Word in its literal sense. . . The celestial and spiritual senses are not the Word, without the natural sense which is the sense of the letter. . . The power of the Divine Truth operates especially against falsities and evils, consequently against the hells; whoever engages in combat against these, must support it by truths from the literal sense of the Word. . . By truths from the literal sense of the Word man is reformed and regenerated. . . The Word in its literal sense is in its fulness, in its holiness, and in its power; and since the Lord is the Word, being the all of the Word, it follows that the Lord in that sense is most eminently present, and that from that sense he teaches and enlightens mankind. . . Man has consociation with the Angels by means of the literal sense."—*The Doctrine of the New Jerusalem concerning the Sacred Scripture*, *art.* 37, 39, 49, 50, 63.

Is this clearly asserting that "the literal sense disappears altogether, and nothing but the allegory remains?"

*Christian Remembrancer* :—" Still more in (Swedenborg's) heretical notion of the Trinity, the substitution of *Manifestation* for *Person*, the threefold soul in man, and doctrines of Angels, all bear a close resemblance to ancient Kabbalism.' —*Ibid.*

*Swedenborg* :—" The Infinite itself, which is above all the heavens, and above the inmost principles appertaining to man, cannot be *manifested* except by the Divine Humanity which appertains to the Lord alone."—" The Infinite Esse, which is Jehovah, cannot possibly be *manifested* to man, except by the Human essence, consequently by the Lord; and it was *manifested* to none but the Lord alone."—*Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 1990.

Is this a substitution of Manifestation for Person ?\*

\* It may be well to remind the reader, not excepting the *Literary Churchman*, of the following passage in our First Tract, p. 51 : " In order to shew that these symbolical Interpretations, have a basis of Truth, and possess a uniformity that is truly remarkable, it will be necessary only to refer to a work entitled, *The Spiritual Exposition of the Apocalypse*, where these mystical or allegorical principles, as advocated by the fathers, are applied to the Interpretation of that book, and at the same time compared with the Interpretations of Swedenborg." *The Spiritual Exposition of the Apocalypse*, in 4 vols. 8vo, was published by Longmans.





# INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION :

BEING AN

ENQUIRY INTO THE RELATION BETWEEN THE LITERAL  
AND SPIRITUAL SENSES OF THE WORD OF GOD,

AS FOUNDED UPON

THE SCIENCE OF CORRESPONDENCE.

BY THE REV. AUGUSTUS CLISSOLD, M.A.,

FORMERLY OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

No. IV.

"Sterling grew to regard an intelligent theory of Inspiration, and of the relation between the Bible and the faith which it conveys, as the most pressing want of our Church. That it is a most pressing one is indeed certain; and such it has been acknowledged to be by those who meditate on Theology."—*Archdeacon Hare's Life of Sterling*, p. 130.

OXFORD :

HENRY HAMMANS, HIGH STREET.

LONDON :

WHITTAKER AND CO.

1862.

LONDON:  
MITCHELL AND SON, PRINTERS,  
WARDOUR STREET, W.

## INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION.

---

"THIS is what the Age is coming to, and I wish it observed," says a writer in the *Tracts for the Times* ;\* "we know it denies the existence of the Church as a divine institution: it denies that Christianity has been cast into any particular social mould. Well; but this I say is not all; it is rapidly tending to *deny the existence of any system* of Christianity either; any creed, doctrine, philosophy, or by whatever other name we designate it."

"I do not see then," says the same writer,† "if men will indulge that eclectic spirit which chooses part, and rejects part of the primitive *Church system*, what is to keep them from choosing part, and rejecting part of the Canon of Scripture."

"I‡ wish to declare what I think will be found really to be the case, *viz.*, that a battle for the Canon of Scripture is but the next step after a battle for the Creed,—that the Creed comes first in the assault, that is all; and that if we were not defending the Creed, we should at this moment be defending the Canon.

"Nay, I would predict as a coming event, that minds *are*

\* Vol. V.; Tract 85, p. 99.    † *Ibid.*, p. 80.    ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 72.



to be unsettled as to what is Scripture and what is not; and I predict it, that, as far as the voice of one person in one place can do, I may defeat my own prediction by making it. Now to consider the subject.

“How do we know that the whole Bible is the Word of God?”

What is the cause of this gradual dissolution of *systems*? The writer tells us it is *Free Enquiry*.

That this prediction concerning Free Enquiry, uttered in A.D. 1838, has been singularly fulfilled, is evident from the present controversy:—

“From whatever point of view,”\* says the Dean of Ely, “it may be proposed to regard the *doctrines* of our religion, with reference to the difficulties which may attach to the reception of them in our days, it is scarcely possible to omit from our consideration the meaning and nature of that *divine inspiration*, which we attribute to the *Holy Scriptures*.”

And the Dean further observes, that the simple Christian may well be content to believe that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God; but that “the theologian has to ask and answer the question, *What does Inspiration mean?*”

“I shall contend,”† says Dr. Phillimore, “that though, most wisely, the Church has never given any precise definition of what is *Inspiration*, it has nevertheless by necessary consequence excluded such views of Inspiration as my learned friends contend for, which would bring it down, when all is explained, to the level of human reason.”

“We contend that, though the Church has wisely not

\* *Hulsean Lectures*, p. 75, 79.

† *Speech of Dr. Phillimore*, in the case of the Bishop of Salisbury *versus* Dr. Williams, p. 81, 174.

defined Inspiration, it has most certainly and clearly excluded that sense of it, which would bring down the Bible to the level of a poem written by Milton, or a sermon composed by Luther," etc.

According to the foregoing statements, the theologian has to ask and answer the question—*What does Inspiration mean?* and the answer of the Church is, 'I can tell you what it does *not* mean, but I cannot tell you what it does.' The consequence is, the Church has no theory of Inspiration, nor can it determine anything with respect to its nature and extent. But the thinking men of the present day are not satisfied with this state of things. The age is urgent in its requirements: the theologian is pressed to answer the question, *What does Inspiration mean?* Now, "to have to deal with questions of this kind is one of the peculiar trials of thinking men."

For the position of Sceptics is a positive one, established upon the principle that Scripture has only one meaning, and this one the literal. The position of the Church is negative, and a merely negative position will not meet the difficulties of the day. This the thinking men of the Church see and feel to be the case. If the Church says that the Bible is the inspired Word of God, it is surely a very natural question to ask, What do you mean by Inspiration? and if the Church says 'I cannot tell,' then let this be openly known to be the real state of the case. The result will be in due time a searching enquiry into the cause of this ignorance; and the Church, or, if not the Church, the Age, will have to reconsider the whole question. For as Archdeacon Hare says,

an intelligent theory of Inspiration has long been acknowledged to be the most pressing want of the day.

The\* Church, however, it is said, has wisely abstained from saying what Inspiration is. But how can it be said, she abstains *wisely* from doing what she is unable to do? If the Church denies the spiritual sense, and if notwithstanding Inspiration consists in the spiritual sense, then, when asked what Inspiration is, it is impossible for the Church to give any true answer; but can this be called *wisdom* on the part of the Church? Here stands the question at present; but here it will *not* stand in this age of enquiry.

"It seems to me," says Mr. Swainson,† "that the time has come for an entire reconsideration of the authority of the writings of the New Testament Dispensation." Suppose we add, 'It seems also that the time has come for an entire reconsideration of the Divine Inspiration of the Old and New Testaments.' That the one enquiry will lead, nay, has already led to the other, there can be no doubt. For instance:—

"Here I would observe," says the Dean of Ely,‡ "that the question of the meaning of the term *Inspiration*, as applied to the Scriptures, is one concerning which we cannot hope to gain so much light from the opinions of Christian antiquity, as we may in the case of some others. Indeed, it seems to me to be essentially a modern question;—one, the great interest and importance of which are found in the

\* *Dr. Phillimore's Speech*, p. 81, 174.

† *The Authority of the New Testament*, etc., p. 6.

‡ *Hulsean Lectures*, p. 80.

general tone given to human thought by the accuracy of modern methods in all branches of scientific and learned research. It may perhaps be said with truth, that to have to deal with questions of this kind, is *one of the peculiar trials of thinking men* in this age; and to shew how they may be treated, without turning our backs upon principles recognized in all branches of human knowledge, is a work, which, if well performed, would be almost *the greatest boon conceivable to the Christian Church*. It helps us but little to be able to say, that the Scriptures were in all ages revered as inspired, to quote the devout expressions of respect with which they were ever mentioned by the fathers of the Church; for though we may conclude from this that a doctrine of Inspiration was always held (concerning which, in fact, there can be no manner of doubt), we may still find ourselves at a loss, when we endeavour to say, what that doctrine was, or whether it be now tenable."

From these remarks, is it not clear that the whole question concerning the Divine Inspiration of the Old and New Testaments is now open; and that to furnish the true solution of the question will be almost the greatest conceivable boon to the Christian Church?

In endeavoring then to promote this desirable object, let us first ask what are the relations of Scripture and Science.

We admit that the accredited conclusions of Science are of a nature to force assent from all those whose education and powers of mind enable them to appreciate the evidence; that if Scripture be interpreted according to a theory of Inspiration which brings it into collision with human science, either the theory must be abandoned, or else the Scripture.

To meet this view of the case it is said :\*—

“ Divine Inspiration *may* imply an absence of errors upon physical questions, or *it may not* : who shall venture to say positively *à priori* whether it does, or no? . . . if it should appear upon examination, that the first chapter of Genesis, or any other chapter, contains statements not in accordance with Science, then, instead of coming to the conclusion that the Scriptures are not inspired, I should rather come to this, namely, that the idea of Inspiration does not involve that accuracy concerning physics which many persons have imagined that it does.”

To this we reply :—

Suppose the subject matter of a narrative in the Bible to be some physical or scientific fact and that *only*, and yet that the alleged fact is wholly without foundation ; in this case, on what has Divine Inspiration to rest ? If the narrative be false in the only respect in which it professed to be true, are not its claims to Inspiration as unfounded as its professed facts ? Even on the lower ground of policy, is it not better to deny that the narrative had any reference to merely physical facts, and to assert that the facts to which it referred are altogether of a higher order ; than to place Inspiration in the merely literal sense, then to question the truth of it, then to make it another question how far Inspiration is consistent with untruth ? If this method has been resorted to by some, it is only because they are forced into it by the inexorable demands of Science ; but this only shews the nature of the opposition to spi-

\* *Hulsean Lectures* by the Dean of Ely, p. 102.

ritual interpretation, in which it would seem that some defenders of the faith would rather imperil the Bible altogether than yield to the principle of spiritual interpretation. Surely a correct Geological account of the origin of the earth, is not so important as the relation of earthly things to heavenly; and therefore it is far more worthy of Divine Inspiration to give us an account of the relation of earthly things to such as are heavenly and eternal, than of earthly things to each other, in the successive order of time.

Now, if we say that it is owing to the *spiritual sense* that the Word is divinely inspired, we say what Inspiration means, and in so doing come into no collision with Science, or merely physical facts of any kind; nor do discoveries in Geology interfere with the interpretation of Scripture in any way.—Nay, it is said, but you subvert historical facts.—I answer: First prove them to be so. One of the questions at issue is, whether they are historical or not: whether they are ethical or physical. But even granting that they are historical and that the history is true, it would not prove the history to be divinely inspired, if Divine Inspiration consists in a spiritual sense within the literal; nor, on the other hand, can such a history in any way supersede the spiritual interpretation. In this case, the notion that Geology gives the death-blow to certain portions of Scripture is puerile: we should rejoice in scientific discovery to any extent, knowing that it could not possibly interfere with the truths of the Word of God.

If, however, we say that Inspiration consists in the spiritual sense and thus explain what Inspiration

means, it becomes a momentous question, In what way is the literal sense connected with the spiritual? We have already said, By the law of correspondence, as the soul is connected with the body. Lord Bolingbroke calls this an allegorical excuse for allegory. But what if the works of God be as allegorical as the Word of God! What if Nature herself be a *Parable*, and all the objects of Nature have a meaning above and beyond Nature! It is this principle which, in the contemplation of Nature, constitutes the difference between the Christian and the infidel. The atheist and the deist both deny it; but is it becoming in the Christian to do so? Nay; has not the denial of this principle brought the Church into its present difficulties? and has not the acknowledgment of this principle become absolutely necessary, in order to maintain the doctrine of the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures?

“Now,” observes Swedenborg,\* “forasmuch as Divine things fix their existence in outward Nature in correspondences, therefore the Word was written by mere correspondences; and for the same reason the Lord, in consequence of speaking from Divinity, spoke by *correspondences*; for whatever proceeds from Divinity, when it comes into outward Nature, manifests itself in such outward things as correspond with what is Divine; which outward things become then the repositories of Divine things, otherwise called celestial and spiritual, which lie concealed within them.”

\* *Doctrine of the New Jerusalem concerning the Sacred Scripture*, art. 20.

Before proceeding further, let the reader be prepared absolutely to admit this principle or absolutely to deny it. If he denies it, he denies all relation between the Word of God and the works of God; he places the Christian, in the contemplation of Nature, upon a level with the Deist. There is no alternative. Its importance in relation to the interpretation of the Word of God is essential; for the same objects are common both to Nature and the Word of God. If *precious stones*, for instance, are symbolical in Nature, they are so in Revelation. We cannot say they have a symbolical meaning in the natural world, and none in the Word of God.

In establishing, then, a true theory of Inspiration, the first step to be taken is the acknowledgment that all Nature is representative. The opponents of the Science of Correspondence must either deny this principle at the outset, or else draw a line between those objects in Nature which are representative, and those which are not.

"There was an opinion," says Mr. Jones, of Nayland,\* "I should rather call it a tradition, amongst some heathen philosophers, that *the world is a parable*, the literal or bodily part of which is manifest to all men, while the inward meaning is hidden, as the soul in the body, the moral in the fable, or the interpretation in the *parable*. They had heard there was such a thing; but to us the whole secret is opened, by the Scripture accommodating all Nature to things spiritual and intellectual; and whoever sees this plan with an unprejudiced mind, will not only be in the way to understand the

\* See his works, vol. iv., *Figurative Language of the Holy Scriptures*, p. 72, 38.



Bible, but he will want no other evidence of the Christian doctrines."

So Clemens of Alexandria :—

"We may call the world a fable, or *parable*; in which there is an outward appearance of visible things, with an inward sense which is hidden as the soul under the body."

Alcasar, in his First Preliminary Discourse to the *Apocalypse*,\* observes, that independently of the natural uses of the various objects of Creation—

"I say a profound philosophy teaches, that in the Creation of things it was the intention of the Artificer and Builder, that in those objects of Creation which come within the reach of our vision, men might also be in possession of wonderful symbols and hieroglyphics, serving to point out to them mystically such lessons as would most highly concern them, viz., true instruction in faith and morals."

"Origen, after pursuing the subject in a beautiful train of reasoning, concludes at last with the following words, 'Therefore may all things be referred upward from the visible to the invisible, from the corporeal to the incorporeal, from the manifest to the hidden; so that the objects of the world may be understood to be created by divine Wisdom according to such a divine dispensation, as from visible things, by means of the things and exemplars themselves, teaches us the invisible, and transfers us from earthly things to those which are of heaven.' Thus far Origen; who doubts not that, in the creation of things corporeal, it was the principal design of the divine Artificer that they should be symbols and traces, as it were, of the mysteries of our faith. Therefore the merely natural office proper to every particular thing, in virtue of which it ministers to other bodies, and in which the philosophy of Aristotle rests, by no means satisfies the infinite

\* See his *Fifteenth Proemial Note*, n. 2.

Wisdom of God, and His especial providence in the salvation of souls; nor indeed His own wonderful counsel whereby He hath determined to raise us from the corporeal to the incorporeal. It is probable, therefore, that the omnipotence of God, when He had the power of making infinite species of souls, plants, and stones, selected and created out of the infinite things which he had in his power, such as were the more apt to signify the mysteries of our salvation, and a conformably moral instruction. And this was accomplished in such a manner, that the universal mechanism of things created should maintain a most beautiful harmony with the wonderful counsel of God in the salvation of men; and that things corporeal should subserve to the representation of those which are spiritual."

Thus far Alcasar.—Even supposing then the first chapter of Genesis to be history, if the world be a *parable*, why not the Creation of the world? If the objects themselves are separately representative, why not the process of their Creation?

"If we consider (the subject) in due order," says Mr. Jones\* of Nayland, "we must begin with the *Creation*, which, as related in the Book of Genesis, is a *pattern of the New Creation in Christ Jesus*, and is so applied by the Apostle: '*God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.*' Till this light shines in the heart of man, he is in the same state as the unformed world was, when darkness lay upon the face of the deep; and when the new creation takes place, he rises in baptism, as the new earth did from the waters, by the spirit of God moving upon them."

\* See his *Works*; vol. iv., *Figurative Language of Scripture*, p. 38.

There is no question, then, if the world in general be a *Parable* and the process of Creation itself *parabolical*, that the whole of the first chapter of Genesis is in the same sense *parabolical*. Yet, strange to say, not one word upon this subject is said in Bishop Patrick's *Commentary*, or in the Family Bible, or in Scott's or Henry's Commentaries, or in abundance of others which might be named. As far as regards the Church of England, it seems to be a method of interpretation which has fallen into such general disuse, that when Geologists have become convinced that the literal sense only cannot stand, a dead silence in regard to any spiritual sense reigns throughout the *Seven Replies* and the *Aids to Faith*: although Papias, a cotemporary of Polycarp, is said to have given a spiritual interpretation to the history of Creation, as we know was the case with Augustin, Jerome, and other fathers.

Among the various answers to the *Essays and Reviews*, that of Mr. Huxtable\* has the credit, when sounding a retreat from what he conceives to be an untenable position, of coming to a final acknowledgment that the first chapter of Genesis is *parabolical*.

"The grounds briefly recapitulated are these;—

"The Divine Inspiration of the section being admitted, but a great want of conformity being noticed between its details if it be construed as history, and the known facts of Nature, we are driven to surmise that our notion of its being *historical* is itself *wrong*; (2) *à priori*, a cosmogenetical

\* *Faith and Peace*, p. 81. *Sacred Record of Creation, etc.*, by E. Huxtable, M.A., Vicar of Weston Zoyland, Somerset, and Prebendary of Wells Cathedral: late Vice-Principal of Wells Theological College.

history was not to be expected, because the communication of such knowledge does not fall within the proper scope of a Divine Revelation: (3) *à priori* again, a cosmogenetical history from heaven was not to be expected, because if true (as of course it must have been), it would have been unintelligible in all ages till now, and most probably even now: it would further have been prejudicial to the proper purpose of a Revelation,—for it would have led men away to speculations on physical Science, it would have made notions of physical Science matter of religion, and it would have impeded faith in the revelation generally, when its statements relative to cosmical facts were not felt to be in accordance with what Science was supposed to teach: (4) the whole manner of the delineation in this section disinclines the reader to regard it as history, and leads him to feel it to be a *Parable*: (5) that it is a *Parable*, and not historical, is evidenced by the consideration that the time in which the events that it refers to took place transcends the historical period, and that therefore, like the closing delineations of the Apocalypse, this opening delineation of Genesis can in all reason be only construed *symbolically*: (6) this first section stands apart from that which follows\* and refuses to be taken in conjunction with it as homogeneous history: and (7) though it is not so obvious to us with our ways of thinking and speaking, to take a passage like this as *parabolic*, with an

\* With respect to the reserve here made in favor of the history of the *Fall*, it is well known that Dr. Middleton was firmly convinced that this narrative also was a "moral fable or allegory;" he complained of the Fathers so often confounding together figure and fact, as did the cotemporaneous Bishop of London in following their example; indeed even the present respected Bishop asks the question with regard to the first Paradise, "Who will venture to draw the limits here between figure and fact?" See *Dangers and Safeguards*, p. 260. Also *The Works of Dr. Conyers Middleton*, Principal Librarian of the University of Cambridge: vol. ii., p. 450.

oriental it would be different; his habits of thinking and speaking would dispose him readily to conceive of it under that character; and we may very easily believe that he might not have thought of it as history at all, but have fastened his mind altogether upon the religious notions which it embodies."

A once celebrated French divine, Jurieu,\* in laying down the principles of interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis, observes :—

"The first of our principles is this, *that everything is full of mysteries in that great work of the Creation*. I suppose this principle, because it will be generally granted by those for whose sake I write: as for those who will have nothing to be found here, but the *Letter* and the *History*, they deserve not to be considered. If their opinion be no *heresy*, it comes very near one: 'tis unworthy of a divine, and I am bold to say, unworthy of an understanding Christian. He must very little have studied the Divine conduct, who doth not take notice of its depth, and that incomparably more is concealed than discovered."

"There are *three* sorts of people who read the Scripture: The simple and ignorant, who are altogether so, studied and deep divines who only are truly divines, and those who are but superficial ones. The first are the lambs, born to eat the grass which grows on the surface of these fields: I do not impute it to *them* as a fault not to penetrate farther. But I know not how to pardon those pretended divines, who tear out the very heart of the Sacred Scriptures, in the mysteries and divine depths therein, and leave it nothing but a bare superficialities."

Now we are told, that the Sceptics of the present day believe only in the letter and the history, and

\* *The Accomplishment of the Scripture Prophecies*, p. 329.

that, as such, Scripture has one meaning and one meaning only. The *Aids to Faith* was written in answer to the Sceptics; and yet on the subject of the *Mosaic Record of Creation* it insists only on the letter and the history, hence on one meaning and one meaning only; thus granting to Sceptical writers the very principle for which they are contending; for their policy is to shew that Scripture has but one meaning, and then that this one meaning is untrue.

Surely, then, if we regard the First Chapter of Genesis as *parabolical*, it is only in harmony with the principle that all Nature is a Parable. But if all Nature be a parable, by what method shall we interpret this Parable? We answer, The Creator is Interpreter. *The Word of God* which created the Parable, the same interprets the Parable. But if so, where in the written Word is the clue to the interpretation? We answer, *In the structure of the Tabernacle*; which leads us to interpretations not desultory but systematic; the system itself being therefore no more of human origin than was the plan of the Tabernacle. God, who in the beginning gave the word for the creation of the heavens and the earth, gave the word also for the building of the Tabernacle itself. In both cases the Architect is the same; and both in the Temple of the Universe and the Temple of Jerusalem are presented to us the patterns of things in the Heavens, whence both are parabolical. And as God created the heavens and the earth, let us not contemplate one apart from the other—Nature apart from the Bible: "*what God hath joined together let no man put asunder.*"

Now in the Temple or the Tabernacle we find that

the Creator and Creation, thus, that the Word of God, the heavens, the mind of man, and hence the universe, all meet as it were together; for the Temple is the Divine Humanity, the three divisions of the Temple are the three Heavens, and hence also, as we shall see, the three degrees of the human mind. That Christ is signified by the *Temple*, is universally acknowledged. That the *three divisions of the Temple* represent the three heavens, has been also seen by various writers, as by St. Anselm,\* St. Remigius, Villalpandus, and others; the *outer court* representing the lowest heaven, the *sanctuary* the second heaven, and the *holy of holies* the third heaven. Both Anselm and Augustin regard these *three heavens* as corresponding also to three ways of knowing things; and this is the case with Swedenborg, who regards these three ways of knowing things as originating from the three regions of the mind of man, as Turretin† remarks:—

“In man there are three parts, the *external senses* which apprehend things sensible, τὰ αἰσθητὰ, and which are in the *atrium* or Court; the *intellect* and *rational mind* which takes cognizance of things apprehended by the intellect, τὰ νοητὰ, and which are in the *Holy place*; and the *heart* or the conscience, which embraces τὰ πιστὰ, the things of faith which are in the *Most Holy place*, which eye hath not seen nor ear heard.”

Thus do the three divisions of the Temple correspond to the three heavens, the three regions of the

\* See St. Anselm on 2 Cor. xii. 1; also Villalpandus on *the Temple*, vol. ii., chap. vi., p. 14.

† *Institutio Theologiæ*, vol. ii., p. 171. See our *Appendix*.

mind, and hence to the three ways of knowing things; hence also arise *the three different senses of the Word*, the highest having relation pre-eminently to *love* or the affections, the next pre-eminently to *truth* or the intellect, and the lowest to both in their natural or ultimate form.

"The case is,"\* observes Swedenborg, "with respect to these three senses of Scripture, as it was with the *Tabernacle*: its *inmost*, or what was within the veil, where was the Ark containing the Testimony, was most Holy, or the *Holy of Holies*; its *internal*, or what was immediately without the veil, where were the golden table and candlestick, was *Holy*; the *external* also, where was the Court, was also *Holy*: the congregation assembled thereat, and hence it was called the tent of the Congregation."

Accordingly, Swedenborg observes that†—"by the *Tabernacle* were represented Heaven and the Church; wherefore the pattern of it was shewn to Moses on Mount Sinai; hence by all things contained in that *Tabernacle*, as the candlestick, the golden altar for incense, and the table whereon was the shewbread, were represented and signified the holy things of Heaven and the Church; and by the Law written on two tables, and enclosed in the Ark, was signified the Lord as respects the Word. Now forasmuch as externals derive their essence from internals, and both the one and the other from what is inmost, which in the *Tabernacle* was the *Law*, therefore *by all things*

\* *Arcana Cælestia*, art. 3439.

† *Doctrine of the New Jerusalem concerning the Sacred Scriptures*, art. 46.



*belonging to the Tabernacle were represented and signified the holy things of the Word."*

Dean Trench\* makes a similar observation :—

"Nor is it unworthy of remark, when we are estimating the amount of the Parabolic element in Scripture, how much beside the spoken, there is there of acted *Parable*. In addition to those which by a more especial right we separate off and call by that name, every type is a real Parable. The whole Levitical constitution with its *outer Court*, its *Holy*, its *Holiest of all*, its high priest, its sacrifices, and all its ordinances is such, and is declared to be such in the Epistle to the Hebrews."

In this case, to *open the Temple* and to *see the Ark* is to explain the Parable, and all that pertains to it: hence on this passage, "*And the Temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in the temple the Ark of his Testament*," Vitringa remarks that it signifies that—

"The Person, the Nature, and the Attributes of Jesus Christ, concerning which there are such labored disputations in the Church, will be clearly known, explained, and illustrated; . . . that the interior mysteries of the heavenly Sanctuary will be laid open to spiritual eyes for contemplation, by the removal of every veil; and that to the true worshippers of God they will be far more clearly and distinctly evident than formerly."

So Berengaud :—

"We may likewise by the *Temple* understand the Old Testament: by the *Ark*, the mysteries concerning Christ which are contained in the Old Testament. For when Christ came in the flesh, the Old Testament was opened, and the

\* *Notes on the Parables*, p. 25.

spiritual meaning which was latent in it, was revealed to the faithful."

So Alexander Alensis :—

"*The Temple of the Lord was opened*, that is, the mystery of Christ was made manifest, *in heaven, i. e.*, in the Scripture of God now opened; for the mystery concerning Christ which had before lay hidden in heaven, *i. e.*, in the Sacred Scripture, was made manifest in the Old Testament by the Lamb who was worthy to open the Book and to loose the seven seals. . . . *And there was seen the Ark of the Testament* in his Temple, that is, those things which were written and shadowed forth in figures concerning Christ, are now revealed; the Ark of the Testament is seen, *i. e.*, Christ; *in his Temple*, that is, in the Church of God. He is called *the Ark*, because in Christ are hidden all the treasures of the wisdom and knowledge of God; and Christ is called the Ark of the Testament, because he fulfilled the Old Testament and originated the New."

So Aretas and Œcumenius :—

"*And the Temple of God in heaven was opened, and the Ark of his Testament was seen in his Temple.*—What does the vision mean by this circumstance? It means, that as it was in former times said to Moses, that those things which he was commanded to execute were significative, and had not the efficacy of the truth signified (for it was said, '*See that thou make all things according to the pattern which was shewed thee on the mount*'); so also that these things are now explained, by exalting the knowledge of the visible types to their corresponding heavenly signification."

So Mr. Isaac Williams on the *Apocalypse* :—

"It must at all events signify that the kingdom and mystery of Christ is now in some sense fully revealed. *The Ark of the Testament*,—the Old Testament laid up therein, is made

manifest and understood : the Lamb hath been found worthy to open the mystery."

If this be the case, may we not say in the words of the same author :\*—

"The cases of Analogy which occur (in Holy Scripture) are so numerous, so manifold, and so remarkable that it seems to intimate something of a vast system, of which these are but the casual intimations ; consequently, that greater light in things divine will consist in a fuller observation of these analogies ; and that to see more deeply into them will be to obtain a higher and greater knowledge of God?"

A similar interpretation of the preceding passage is given by almost all Commentators, both ancient and modern, the only difference being with respect to the period of its fulfilment ; some referring it to the time of our Saviour, some to that of the Reformation, and others to a period yet to come ; all however agreeing, that it points to some further revelation of the mysteries contained in the Word of God, and to the antichristian opposition it would occasion.

We thus see the Scriptures intimately connected both with the Temple and the Ark ; indeed if the Temple was constructed for the Ark, and the Ark for the Decalogue, and the Decalogue represented the whole Word of God, then the throwing open of the three compartments of the Temple naturally suggests some corresponding threefold revelation of the mysteries of the Word of God. In this point of view, we perceive at once the connection between the threefold distinction of the Temple, the Heavens, the human mind, and the Word of God : a distinction which is

\* *Thoughts on the Study of the Holy Gospels*, p. 201.

no more of human origin than is that of the world itself into the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms.

Now the doctrine of Inspiration, as founded upon this view of the subject, cannot be cooped up within the narrow theories of theologians, which are invented only to meet the requirements of individual minds: it indicates a vast and extensive system, coextensive indeed with the goings forth from of old of the Word of God. It is the doctrine of the communication of Divine life—a life communicated both to Angels and men, thus to the Church in heaven and the Church on earth, by *Inspiration*; and the life thus communicated, consequently Inspiration itself, partakes of that threefold distinction which is common to the whole universe visible and invisible. Angels may declare to men, and men respond to Angels, "*The Spirit of God hath made me, and the BREATH of the Almighty hath given me life.*"—For, "*Wisdom is the BREATH of the power of God, a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty.*"

Hence as Swedenborg observes; \*—

"*Inspiration* implies that in all parts of the Word, even the most minute, as well historical as others, are contained celestial things which appertain to *love* or *good*, and spiritual things which appertain to *faith* or *truth*, consequently things Divine. For what is inspired by the Lord descends from Him through the Angelic Heavens, and thence through the World of Spirits, till it reaches man; before whom it presents itself in such a form as the Word has in its letter,

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 1887.

which is altogether different from that which belongs to it in its first origin. In Heaven there is not any worldly history, but the whole is representative of things divine; nor is anything else there perceived; as may also be known from the acknowledged fact, that the words there heard are unspeakable by man. Wherefore unless the historical relations be representative of things divine, and be thus celestial, they cannot possibly be *divinely inspired*. What is the nature of the Word in the heavens can be known only from the internal sense; for the internal sense is *the Word of the Lord in the heavens.*"

Thus, then, the Inspiration of the Sacred Scripture consists in the internal sense; and to unfold that internal sense is to explain the nature of the Inspiration, or of those truths which are spirit and which are life.

*Inspiration*, then, is not a metaphorical but an allegorical term: it signifies *breathing into*, so that the internal sense of Scripture signifies a sense or meaning *breathed into* the external sense. But the Bible is a book, and what can be the meaning of breathing into a book? I answer; the book *per se* is a dead letter; but when I read it, that which I read is transferred to my mind: it is in my mind that exists the literal sense, and in which therefore the *breathing* or *inspiration*, and thus the vivification or animation, of the letter takes place. The inspiration of the Almighty giveth understanding not to the book, but to the reader: awakening in the mind the spiritual idea corresponding to the outward sign written in the book. This inspiration is the inspiration of the

Spirit of Truth, which breathes into the outward forms of our consciousness the inward truths which give them life, and which are thus the interior life of the understanding.

This life, which is received from divine inspiration, exists in man as the breath of his spirit: hence the origin of the expression of "thoughts that breathe;" thought from affection being only, as it were, mental breathing: or that function of the mind which corresponds to the respiration of the body. Hence it is that the Spirit of Truth is called *breath* or *spirit*, and that *wisdom* is called the *breath* of the power of God. Thus as *love* is spoken of in reference to the functions of the heart or its *pulsation*, so *wisdom* is spoken of in reference to the function of the lungs or to *breathing*; wisdom purifying the affections, as respiration purifies the blood.

The view of Inspiration, then, here presented, establishes a direct relation between the Works of God and the Word of God: the two are in harmony because in correspondence with each other. It is therefore opposed to that doctrine of Inspiration which ignores or denies the correspondence between the two; and which, instead of regarding Nature as uttering the truths of the Bible, compels the Bible to utter only those of Nature; and to subordinate itself to the discoveries of the Geologist, or rather, as stated by Dr. Phillimore,\* to the criticism of the Sceptic who says,—“We do not want canons to interpret Scripture, we want to know what makes Scripture at

\* *Speech of Dr. Phillimore in the Court of Arches, in the case versus Dr. R. Williams, p. 8.*

all; we do not wish to learn how far or how little it agrees with Science—we wish it to take the place that Science shall assign to it.”

The truth is, the general denial of the Doctrine of Correspondence has placed not only the Bible but the Church in a false position: it has subordinated both to natural Science, instead of natural Science to both; it has placed the divine below the Geologist, and then sent him in search of an Act of Parliament to relieve him of his sacred office. Whereas, admitting the true Doctrine of Correspondence, what is the true place of the Church?

“There is in Scripture,” says Mr. Isaac Williams,\* “the literal sense and the spiritual sense; there is a visible Church and a Church invisible.” The literal sense then is to the spiritual, what the visible Church is to the invisible. The spiritual sense is for the spiritual or invisible Church, the literal sense for the visible Church; but in like manner as the visible Church is in connection with the invisible, so is the literal sense in connection with the spiritual. Destroy the spiritual sense, and you destroy the connection of the visible Church with the invisible, or of the natural with the supernatural.

“The Church being a supernatural society,” says Hooker,† “doth differ from natural societies in this, that the persons unto whom we associate ourselves in the one are men simply considered as men, but they to whom we be joined in the other, are God, Angels, and holy men”. . . “Neither are Angels themselves so far severed from us in their kind and

\* *Study of the Gospels*, p. 257.

† *Ecclesiastical Polity*, book i., chap. 15, sec. 2; chap. 16, sec. 4.

manner of working, but that between the law of their heavenly operations and the actions of men in this our state of mortality, such *correspondence* there is as maketh it expedient to know in some sort the one, for the other's more perfect direction. Would Angels acknowledge themselves fellow-servants with the sons of men, but that both having one Lord, there must be *some kind of law which is one and the same to both*, whereunto their obedience being perfecter, is to our weaker both a pattern and a spur."

In this point of view, to deny the spiritual sense of Scripture, is to deny the connection of the supernatural society in heaven with the natural society upon earth. In this case the visible Church being left to itself, chooses the literal or natural sense of Scripture, to the exclusion of the spiritual and supernatural; and thus excludes itself from union with the Church in heaven. Have we not here a sufficient explanation of the evils which are now afflicting the Church?

There are, however, three principal objections to the Doctrine of Correspondence as now explained: the First is, that it can never be reduced to any true system; the Second, that it is dangerous to employ it in eliciting the doctrines of the Church: the Third, that no real connection can ever be established between the literal and spiritual senses of Scripture.

First, the Doctrine of Correspondence can never be reduced to any true system. Thus it is observed by a respected author above mentioned:\*

"And now we proceed to shew certain general forms or schemes of Analogy throughout the Scriptures, after first

\* *Study of the Gospels*, by the Rev. Isaac Williams, p. 206.



premising by way of caution that, the reducing of things to *scheme* and *system* in religion is a practice of itself defective and liable to error. On subjects Divine and therefore partaking of what is Infinite, there is always a danger in attempting to class and separate into definite and human systems of division. The relations and dependencies of things are so great, that there is often much fallacy in marking out and distinguishing, and then arguing upon our own divisions and distinctions." . . . "Things Divine, as things natural, blend with one another so imperceptibly, that no definite and accurate line can be drawn between them." . . . Yet—"We may still have recourse to them (*viz.*, system and divisions) in order to arrange our ideas and facilitate our enquiries. And we may be perhaps allowed to throw these analogies into something of a *scheme*, being at the same time aware that they run into each other, and into other numerous and indefinable analogies not to be embraced in the same. Shallow minds alone can rest in *systems*, and be satisfied with the apparent ease and clearness with which they arrange great truths; their seeming clearness often arises from their passing over all the difficulties without diving into their depths; for *system* is human, and squares out, delineates, and defines the surface: the subjects systematized are of a nature Divine and Infinite, and contain within them unfathomable deeps." . . . "In\* reading the Gospels we must not be satisfied with only a limited or superficial interpretation, but are to consider the various modes in which the analogies may be connected with any one event and expression; and to remember that one simple and manifest interpretation is no reason why manifold others may not be equally true; and that a more deep and extensive knowledge of Scripture might be enabled to elicit them in a manner to satisfy any reasonable mind of their truth."

\* *Ibid.*, p. 270.

This manifold interpretation is not said to arise from the non-existence of any system of analogies; on the contrary,—

“If\* we take separate emblems in Holy Scripture, and find them frequently used in one sense, so as to indicate and mark some definite meaning, and that this our opinion of its mystical sense is confirmed by the opinion of great and good writers, so as to be sure that we are using it in a reasonable and safe manner; and if we put many of these together as thus explained, we shall find, I think, that they will afford something like a *system*, as if all external nature was *systematically* expressive of things spiritual and invisible, through a very extensive analogy.”

Accordingly it is said—

“That† there seem indications not only that the signs and emblems are in themselves definite and fixed, as representing things spiritual and invisible, but also that they fall in with others and with each other, so as to form a *system*.”

How then is it that we are not thus supplied with any systematic Doctrine of Correspondence? Because‡—

“The whole of this subject of Analogy goes upon the supposition, that it is of a nature so intricate and so extensive, that we cannot attempt to do anything more than to point out glimpses and indications of it;—sufficient to shew that there does exist such analogy as far as it goes;—but with no idea of tracing out its infinite relations, and the mutual correspondence of various analogies; or indeed any single one entire.”

We thus see that, in the system of Nature and the system of Revelation, there exists a definite system of Correspondence; but so vast and intricate as to be

\* *Ibid.*, p. 268.

† *Ibid.*, p. 267.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 249.

beyond the reach of human faculties ; that we must, therefore, be content with only occasional glimpses of it : and that if from these we form a system, it must be of human origin, not of divine. The consequence is, that we are left without any true system of interpretation ; any definite Doctrine of Correspondence. It exists indeed, but we cannot reach it ; and hence *systematic* interpretation upon this principle becomes impossible. Everything is regarded as having infinite meanings, and thus we seem to come to the maxim of Cocceius, *Scriptura significat quicquid potest significare*. This is one school.

Now, the very fact that this mode of interpretation cannot be conformed to any rule, is urged by some theologians as a reason for rejecting it altogether ; by others, for denying also that either in the Book of Nature or of Revelation any such system of analogy can be shewn to exist. This is another school.

Is there then any alternative between these two extremes ? We are told that there is, in the adoption of a *middle course*. "This mode of interpretation," says Dr. Van Mildert,\* "may not indeed be safely trusted even to the most learned or well-intentioned expositor, unless he be content to circumscribe it within the limits of such necessary rules as those which have been suggested." What limits ? Those which are proper to a "*middle course*" between excess and defect. Here begins accordingly another phase of the argument ; for—how are we to ascertain this middle course ?—"Here great judgment is often necessary ; neither to do too little nor to attempt

\* *Bampton Lectures*, p. 246.

too much." Individual judgment alone, then, points out the *middle course*.

"The Temple\* service of the Jews and the whole ceremonial Law of Moses may be regarded as of a typical character, *so far as respects their general design*. But here, as in Parables, and all figurative portions of Scripture, the parallel between the literal and mystical sense must not be too minutely extended: an error into which fanciful Expositors are prone to fall, and by which the Sacred Writings have often been subjected to the ridicule of the undiscerning and profane."

Similar is the observation of Calvin upon the words, "*See that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed thee in the mount*." "Wherefore,"† says he, "we must here pursue *a middle course*, which we shall do if we do not seek to know more than has been revealed in Christ." In the present case, what is it that was revealed to Moses?—A model or a pattern, according to which he was to make the Tabernacle strictly in every particular. This model was shewn to him from heaven, with all the details of curtains, taches, loops, boards, sockets, etc. "But," says Calvin, "we must not be over-curious in these matters, and seek for some deep meaning in the several taches and like minutiae, as Hesychius has taken such pains to do, and a good many of the ancient writers." Now the question is, when this model was seen in *heaven*, had these particulars any significance *there*? Was the model *there*, for the most part, a mere unmeaning exhibition of trifling minutiae? If this be

\* *Bampton Lectures*. By Dr. Van Mildert, p. 238.

† See on Heb. viii. 5.

the case, then in the interpretation of the model the Angels in heaven must have been as much under the necessity of pursuing *a middle course* as men upon earth: it might have been one of those things which they desired to look into, but which they need not have done, as most of the objects of their enquiry, far from being too deep for their investigation, were wholly insignificant. I mention this, because the case of the Tabernacle is that of the written Word of God. In the interpretation of both, the "middle course" is recommended. If the Scriptures be truly the Word of God, and the office of the Church be to interpret that Word, as the office of Moses was to make the Tabernacle according to the model, Moses would have been as much justified in pursuing a middle course in building the Tabernacle, as the Church itself in giving its interpretation. When the model was shewn to that prophet, and he was commanded to make every particular according to it, what should we say if he had availed himself of the excuse of modern theologians, and said, "This means only in so far as respects the general design?"

"We need not," says Professor Stuart,\* "with Cocceius, Bishop Horne, and other writers of this description, find Christ *everywhere* in the Old Testament: nor need we, as has been said of Grotius, come to the conclusion that he is to be found *nowhere* in it. There is some *middle path* between these extremes."

So, likewise, Professor Fairbairn,† referring to the Tabernacle as a pattern of heavenly things:—

\* *Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy*, p. 32.

† *Typology of Scripture*, vol. ii., p. 224.

"Here, also, there is a *middle path* which is the right one, and it is possible, in searching for the truths embodied in those patterns of heavenly things, to err by excess as well as defect. We are not to suppose that a separate and distinct meaning attaches to each part by itself or to the separate qualities, perhaps, of the materials of which the different parts are composed."

Dean Trench has availed himself of a similar latitude in the interpretation of the parables?\*. The question is asked, How much of them is to be taken as significant? What circumstances are essential; what are only incidental? The answer is, "There have been exaggerations on both sides;"—"we are obliged to confess that no absolute rule can be laid down beforehand to guide the expositor as to how far he shall proceed. Much must be left to good sense," etc.—This is the method which Dr. Van Mildert calls the *middle course*;† but which is not open to any interpreter who has first of all laid down the principle, as Dean Trench has done, that *all* Nature is symbolical. It is as if one should begin by asserting that the Tabernacle and all that related to it was symbolical; and when he finds in some prophecy something relating to the Tabernacle which he cannot interpret, he should plead the excuse that we must not press the symbol too closely, or indulge in curiosities of interpretation; that the symbol itself is not an essential, is only incidental, adventitious, supplementary, and so forth; and is therefore, in this particular passage, not to be expected to have any meaning.

\* *Notes on the Parables*, p. 35, 16.

† *Bampton Lectures*, p. 230.

Mr. Fairbairn\* claims a similar latitude in regard to the interpretation of the *appurtenances* of the Tabernacle. He acknowledges, first of all, that God exhibited to Moses "the pattern of things in the heavens, after which it (viz., the Tabernacle) was in every particular to be constructed;" but then the Tabernacle was likewise to be moveable, and there were things without which it would not have preserved either this property, or its tent-like appearance;—"Therefore, to seek for some deeper and spiritual reasons for such things as the boards and bars, the rings and staves, the different sorts of coverings, the loops and taches, etc., is to go entirely into the region of conjecture, and give unbounded scope to the exercise of fancy."

What is this but the very same latitude which is adopted also in the interpretation of the Apocalypse?

"It needs no argument to shew," says Mr. Desprez,† "that the Apocalypse is a highly figurative and allegorical composition. Now, the great fault of interpreters in explaining allegory, is *the attempt to carry minute explanations too far*. This has been the cause of irremedial mischief, and has originated a host of absurdities and errors."

"There is always a Divine truth under each symbol; there is always a Divine basis under the allegory;—and this is the truth to be prominently brought forward, the remaining parts of the symbol being only helps to *finish out* the picture. What rule, then, is here left to guide us? We must remember we are told that Scripture must ever be interpreted according to the analogy of Scripture, and that *ample allowance* must be made for Oriental phraseology and Biblical metaphor."

\* *Typology of Scripture*, vol. ii., p. 223.

† *Apocalypse Fulfilled*, p. 32, 436.

Nay, but after this *ample allowance* for metaphor has been made, the Sceptic turns round and demands, What is Scripture?\*

“What do they mean when they say that the Bible is the Word of God? Do they mean to say that they must believe in *every word*—IN WHAT? In the Bible? and what is the Bible?—they have introduced a metaphor in the indictment, and they say, Because you have used language which is inconsistent with this metaphor, therefore you are a heretic.”

No wonder that one of the most sceptical of the Essayists has regarded this work on the Apocalypse with no ordinary admiration!

Such is the dilemma into which we are led by *the middle path*, and which every interpreter is at liberty to make as wide, or as long, or as short as he pleases, and in whatever direction he pleases.

For who will point out the “middle course” in regard to the natural world, and say, These objects have a meaning above and beyond Nature, and those have not: this part of the world belongs to natural theology, and that to Revelation; for as Christ, who is the Creator, is not to be found everywhere in his own Word, so he is not to be found everywhere in his own works: though, however, he is not to be found *everywhere*, yet he is to be found *somewhere*, and that *somewhere* depends upon the opinion of the Expositor? Surely if *precious stones* had been admitted to be representative in the natural world, why not also in the Bible? In this case it would not be at the option of the Expositor to say that stone, wood, or brass was not symbolical: his only alternative would be

\* See our *Third Tract*, p. 55.



between the symbolical and the Deistical interpretation of Nature.

Accordingly this is the issue of the argument. It is a downright contest between Deism and Christianity, as to which of the two shall have the interpretation of Nature. There must be no "middle course" between the two; no tampering with the deist by handing over to him one part of the Universe for the purpose of Deism, the other part to the divine for the purpose of Revelation; nor is the portion to be assigned to Christ the Lord of All, to depend upon the Expositor. We must no longer take private judgment as our rule, but find out some rule which shall be the guide of private judgment. A judgment formed upon no rule can no longer be a guide. The Church must now make a choice between the two courses, and upon this choice will depend its future destiny. If the Temple is to be interpreted like any other building, the Bible will be interpreted like any other book; the *Humanity* of our Lord, signified by the *Temple*, will be as the humanity of any other man; and one Church, whatever be its teaching, as good as another. As long as we speak of the Science of Correspondence apart from its application to the Bible, as long as we admit that we do not know in what Inspiration consists, the question concerning Correspondence might seem to be only speculative and unnecessary; but when it is seen to be the very basis of the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures; when the Divine element is admitted to be in the human, the spiritual in the natural, by Correspondence only, the whole question changes its aspect,

and involves not only the Divine Inspiration of the Word of God, but the very existence of the Church itself. In this case the controversy of the Church is not with Allegorists; she has enough to do to maintain her ground against the Sceptic, and only imperils her position by asserting, against all parties, that there can be no such thing as a definite system of Analogy, a definite theory of Inspiration, or a definite rule of Interpretation.

For—as the spiritual sense of Scripture is founded upon the Science of Correspondence, so a denial of that sense involves a denial of this doctrine; the consequence is, a denial of all connection between the works of God and the Word of God, and an agreement of the divine with the sceptic, that the Word of God has one meaning only, and the works of God no meaning at all. You may argue with the Deist that design implies a designer, in which the Sceptic may readily agree, but there are no means left of bringing the Natural World within the province of Revelation; by surrendering the Science of Correspondence, the Church virtually concedes to the Sceptic, that no such doctrine can be established; and however indifferent the Church may feel upon the subject, not so the Sceptic, who feels that the Church by her silence acknowledges her weakness and his triumph.

“That\* the doctrine of a universal analogy between spiritual and natural things has its foundation in the Word of God, appears to me,” says a writer, “as clear and undeniable as that faith in Christ is taught in the same

\* *Essays on the Universal Analogy between the Natural and Spiritual Worlds*, p. 20. Originally published by Hatchard, but now out of print.

Scriptures. There is hardly a chapter in the Sacred volume, I believe, which does not set forth this great truth directly or indirectly."

Whose words are these? Those of a man who had been a confirmed Deist, and was afterwards converted to Christianity principally by observing the relation between the works of God and the Word of God as founded upon some law of Correspondence:—

"At\* the time," says he, "of my poor conversion to the Christian faith by the teachings of the Analogy of Nature in great measure, these spiritual views of natural things were, as I may say, poured like a flood into my mind continually and involuntarily, and suffered me not to rest. . . . In reading the Evangelist, I heard the Lord saying to those who heard his parables, *He that hath ears to hear let him hear*. It seemed to me that he had given me such an ear; and therefore I hoped that I might hear or understand without presumption. I am aware that some may think me presumptuous for supposing that I understood the parables of Scripture without human assistance: but I was in the jungles or wildernesses of Hindostan, surrounded by infidels and atheists, and no expositor near me except Him who teaches more effectually than any man. . . . I had long despised and rejected the plain truths of His glorious Gospel from infidel pride, ignorance and corrupt prejudices, and was completely hardened against such plain but wholesome doctrine: He therefore in his infinite mercy spoke to my heart and mind in the Analogy of the parables of Nature: and as I first ascribed the discernment which He gave me to my own ingenuity, I was flattered and allured to persist; until by degrees all the truths of the Law, and afterwards those of the Gospel of Salvation, were graciously and wonderfully

\* *Ibid.*, p. 88.

revealed to my soul. . . . *Woe unto you, ye lawyers* (or expounders of the Law), *for ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered.* That Analogy is one key of spiritual knowledge was evident to me, and it was therefore evident to me from this Scripture, that I ought to use it as a Christian, without being frightened by those who tried to hinder me from entering in."

. . . "It\* is now full twenty years since I first began to commit my thoughts on this subject to paper, and I have found the employment both delightful and profitable. It has greatly increased and strengthened my faith: and as my faith increased, so did my views of Analogy become more clear and general. If philosophy be a noble study; and if the philosophy of nature, or in other words, the wisdom of God in Nature, be the most noble and profitable of all that is called human philosophy, then the study of the analogies of Nature with reference to the Word of God, is the most noble and useful of all philosophy. It gives a key and opens a door of entrance into the mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven, or into the Temple of the Tabernacle of the testimony in heaven."

. . . "Most† of what are called serious or religious persons do believe the Bible to be the Word of God; but they do not, so far as I can find, believe Nature to have been made with any proper *spiritual* views or purposes; and to them it therefore appears absurd that any one should expect to find in the Bible a universal analogy or correspondence with the book of Nature. Even if it should be found to exist, they, or some of them, consider it to be as it were accidental with respect to any spiritual application, and without any such intention of analogy in the Creator; so at least I have found some evangelical and pious persons say. Hence

\* *Ibid.*, p. 20.

† *Ibid.*, p. 167.

they reject the analogy of Nature with Holy Scripture decidedly—as a seal of the truth of evangelical doctrines; and as an ordained instrument of conversion or conviction; and only use it very cautiously as an unparalleled medium of illustration, because no man can be intelligible without it.”

This statement, however, does not represent the full extent of the mischief. Mr. Jones, of Nayland, who published certain Lectures on the *Figurative Language of Holy Scripture*, observes :—

“It\* hath been shewed in the Second and Third Lectures, that the great use of Nature, in the hand of God, is to instruct man; and, from the works of Nature, give him a right understanding of such things as are above Nature; and the matter is beyond dispute, because the fact speaks for itself. Yet, *to my astonishment this is denied, and even scouted by learned men*, who profess a critical judgment of all literary productions; though this sublime and delightful method of teaching is notorious throughout the Old and New Testament.”

Here then are two instances, the one in which a Deist was converted from Deism to Christianity by observing the correspondences between Nature and Revelation, or between the works of God and the Word of God; and yet whose subsequent experience in the religious world, by the general denial of this Doctrine of Correspondence, would have forced him back into Deism, had not his own religious convictions triumphed over the antagonism.

Next we have the efforts of an eminent divine to establish the same principle of relation between the works of God and the Word of God; but the oppo-

\* *Ibid.* See his works; vol. iv., p. 272. *Preface to a Discourse*, etc.

sition he also encounters both from the Church and the world is such, that he is obliged to be as cautious and reserved upon the subject as if he were in the midst of open enemies.

And now what has happened in the present day? A distinguished divine, whose zeal in behalf of the return of the Jews to Jerusalem is the result of the literal interpretation to the exclusion of the spiritual, thus writes :—

“The prevalence of the *spiritual interpretation* will make prophecy the scorn of the Jew and the infidel, and harden them in their unbelief. A principle therefore which undermines the foundations of our faith and hope, which gives the lie to the Divine promises, and represents God as an equivocator, must surely be rejected as false.”

One meaning only, and that one the literal, is therefore adopted ; and this distinguished literalist is selected as one of the champions in the *Aids to Faith* against the Sceptics, of whom we are informed, “that Scripture has one meaning, and one meaning only, is seen to be and felt to be one of the keys of their position ;” literalism thus effecting an arrangement between two opposite parties, the one thus retaining the doctrine of the literal return of the Jews to Jerusalem, the other retaining undisturbed in their hands the key to their own position.

But it has been objected by the literalist, that allegorical interpretations can never be relied on for the establishment of any Christian doctrine or precept : that we cannot depend upon an occult sense to establish any position of importance, especially any articles of faith : that as history implies literal facts,

so doctrine implies literal truth ; and that allegorical interpretation undermines both. This is the second principal objection to the Science of Correspondence which we proceed to consider.

Here then arises the question, What is the relation of allegorical interpretation to the Creeds of the Church? The Creeds are professedly drawn from Scripture: they contain the doctrines of the Church: by what method of interpretation are those doctrines professedly established, the literal or the spiritual? Undoubtedly the literal. It is, therefore, a maxim of the Catholic Church that doctrine ought to be drawn from the literal sense of the Word, and that it should serve as a guide in searching for the spiritual sense.

The Gnostics, we are told, were guilty of violating this rule, and invented a spurious allegorical system, of which they availed themselves in order to elicit from Scripture their own doctrinal figments. Let us compare this method of the Gnostics with that which has been adopted by Swedenborg: the reason for which we shall see in the sequel. According to the Dean of Westminster, in his *Notes on the Parables*, the case is thus stated by Tertullian:—

“The\* whole scheme of the Gnostics, as he observes, was a great floating *cloud palace*, the figment of their own brain, with no counterpart in the actual world of realities. They could therefore shape or mould it as they would ; and thus they found no difficulty in forcing the parables to be on their side. For they really modified their scheme, shaping their *doctrine* according to the leadings and suggestions of these,

\* *Notes on the Parables*, p. 43.

till they brought the two into apparent agreement with one another. There was nothing to hinder them here; their *Creed* was not a fixed body of Divine truth, to which they could neither add nor take away, which was given them from above, and in which they could only acquiesce: but it was an invention of their own, and they could shape, fashion, and alter it as they pleased, and as best suited their purposes. We, as Tertullian often says, are kept within limits in the exposition of the parables, accepting, as we do, the other Scriptures as the rule to us of truth, as the rule therefore of their interpretation. It is otherwise with these heretics; their *doctrine* is their own; they can first dexterously adapt it to the Parables, and then bring forward this adaptation as a testimony of its truth."

The Dean had previously remarked, that—

"The\* whole scheme of the Gnostics was one, which, however it may have been a result of the Gospel, inasmuch as that set the religious speculation of the world vigorously astir, was yet of independent growth; and they only came to the Scripture to find a varnish, an outer Christian colouring, for a system essentially anti-Christian; they came not to learn its language, but to see if they could not compel it to speak theirs; with no desire to draw *out of* Scripture its meaning, but only to thrust *into* Scripture their own. When they fell thus to picking and choosing from it what they might best turn to their ends, the *parables* naturally invited them almost more than any other portions of Scripture; for it was plain that they must abandon the *literal* portions of Scripture; they could find no color for their scheme in them; their only refuge was in the *figurative*, in those which might receive more interpretations than one; such perhaps they might bend to their purposes. . . . Against these Gnostics



Irenæus lays down that Canon, namely, that the *parables* cannot be in any sense the primary, nor yet the exclusive, foundations of any *doctrine*, but must be themselves interpreted according to the analogy of faith; since, if every subtle solution of one of these might raise itself at once to the dignity and authority of a Christian *doctrine*, the rule of faith would be nowhere. So to build, as he shews, would be to build, not on the rock, but on the sand."

Accordingly Dean Trench observes : \*—

"The *parables* may not be made first sources and seats of *doctrine*. *Doctrines* otherwise and already established may be illustrated, or indeed further confirmed by them; but *it is not allowable to constitute doctrine first by their aid*. They may be the outer ornamental fringe, but not the main texture, of the proof. For from the *literal* to the figurative, from the clearer to the more obscure, has been ever recognized as the order of Scripture interpretation."

It appears then that the Gnostics had recourse to the allegorical sense of parables, in order thence to deduce their doctrine; and the Catholic writers determined, in opposition to the Gnostics, that before resorting to the allegorical sense doctrines were to be established, and to be drawn from the literal sense of the Word. How then could any author more effectually oppose the Gnostics, and more closely coincide in this respect with the Catholic Church, than Swedenborg in the following remarks?†—

"They who read the Word without *doctrine*, or who do not form to themselves *doctrine* from the

\* *Ibid.*, p. 39.

† *Doctrine of the New Jerusalem concerning the Sacred Scripture*, art. 53, 52, 54.

Word, are in the dark concerning every truth ; their minds must be wavering and unsettled, prone to errors, and easily betrayed into heresies. *Doctrine* is the only light which can guide them in their enquiries.

"*Doctrine* ought to be drawn from the *literal sense* of the Word, and to be confirmed thereby. The reason of this is, because the Lord is present in that sense ; enlightening and teaching man the truths of the Church ; for all the Lord's operations are performed in fulness, and the Word in *its literal sense* is in its fulness : this is the true ground why *doctrine* ought to be drawn from the *literal sense*." Accordingly he further says,—

"The experience of all the Christian world proves that the Word is seen from, and explained according to *doctrine*. All of the Reformed Church see and explain the Word from and according to their own *doctrine* : in like manner the Papists from and according to theirs ; nay, the Jews from and according to theirs. Consequently falsities arise from false doctrine, and truths from that which is true. Hence it appears that true *doctrine* is like a candle in the dark, and like a directing post on the road. But *doctrine* is not only to be drawn from the *literal sense* of the Word, but it is also to be confirmed by that sense ; for if it be not confirmed by it, the truth of *doctrine* appears as if the intellect of man only, and not the Divine Wisdom of the Lord, were contained in it ; and thus *doctrine* would be like a house in the air, and not upon the earth, and therefore without foundation."

We thus see that the rule which is here laid down for first deducing doctrine from the literal sense of the Word, and then employing it as a guide to the spiritual sense, is the same with that of the Catholic Church, to whose example therefore Swedenborg appeals in words as clear as the sun in the firmament. How then is it that Dean Trench has fallen into the error of imputing to Swedenborg, in this respect, the method of the Gnostics? \* For when the Dean says that they abandoned the literal interpretation of Scripture, and resorted to the allegorical, "with no desire to draw out of Scripture its meaning, but to thrust into Scripture their own," and this, as Irenæus states, only *ut figmentum illorum non sine teste esse videatur*, he adds, "All this very nearly repeats itself in Swedenborg, in whom indeed there are many resemblances to the Gnostics of old, especially the distinctive one of a division of the Church into spiritual and carnal members." † Surely, if reading an author's writings

\* *Notes on the Parables*, p. 41.

† Where a statement of this kind is made, either a quotation or a reference ought to have been given; but there is neither, nor indeed is any such division of the members of the Church to be found in Swedenborg's writings. His only doctrine upon this subject occurs in *The True Christian Religion*, ch. ix., *On Repentance*; ch. x., *On Regeneration*; also in his *Doctrine of Life*, sec. 9; where it may be seen, that the natural or carnal man is no member of the Church, except in the same sense in which he might be a member of the Church of England; indeed not even in that, as he is not considered to be regenerate. As a sample of differences of opinion with regard to resemblances to Gnostics, it may be observed, that Bishop Marsh says of Irenæus, "He justly objects to the allegorical interpretations of the Gnostics, though his own interpretations are sometimes as fanciful as those of his opponents."—*Lecture 11*, p. 467.

with no desire to draw out of them their meaning, but to infuse into them one's own; in other words, if making an author say what he does not say, has a semblance of Gnosticism, we ask with all possible deference, who it is that is so doing in the present case; especially considering what had been said in the advertisement to the *Notes to the Parables*—

"Where my quotations have been made at second-hand, I have very frequently noted the channel through which I derived them, and, if possible, seen with my own eyes the passage, quoted or referred to; as one soon learns how often men, without meaning to be untrue, will yet lay greater weight on a passage than it will justly bear, or will give a maimed or partial account of their author's meaning."

There is, however, a further statement by the Dean of Westminster in regard to Swedenborg's interpretations, which, I respectfully acknowledge, deserves very serious attention; and as it will lead us into a searching investigation into the connection between the literal and spiritual senses, we proceed to consider it under the head of the Third objection, according to which no real connection can ever be established between the literal and spiritual senses. The objection is thus stated by Bishop Marsh :\*—

... "If we endeavor to find an allegorical sense either in history or in prophecy, we endeavor to find a sense with which the literal sense is *wholly unconnected*. The sense therefore will be supplied by mere imagination: and not only will different interpreters invent different senses, but even the same interpreter may invent as many as he pleases.

\* *Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible*, p. 455, 446.

“In the interpretation of a prophecy to which a double meaning is ascribed, we have *no clue whatever* which can lead us from the primary to the secondary sense. The primary sense is suggested by the words of the prophecy. But the secondary sense is suggested neither by the words of the prophecy, nor by the things which those words signify. It is a hidden, a remote sense; indeed so hidden, and so remote from the literal sense, that it is supposed to have been unknown even to the prophet who committed the prophecy to writing.”

The consequence is, that Bishop Marsh confines a spiritual sense to those particular instances which are specified in the Bible. Even in these cases, however, he requires us to receive the spiritual sense, not because there is any perceptible connection between the literal and the spiritual, but solely on the ground of *divine authority*. Accordingly, where, it is said, there is no divine authority, the literal sense is regarded as everywhere without any spiritual sense; and wherever any spiritual sense is given by an interpreter, whether in or out of the Catholic Church, it is affirmed to be, from the very necessity of the case, altogether independent of and disconnected from the letter.

The same doctrine is maintained by Professor Stuart in his *Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy*, and by the advocates of literalism in general; indeed, to a certain extent, even by the very advocates themselves of *spiritual* interpretation:—

“I am proving,” says Mr. Burgon,\* “that Scripture itself, literally understood, compels us to believe that under the letter of Scripture, (which of course is to be interpreted literally), there lies a deeper, and sometimes a far less obvious

\* *Inspiration and Interpretation*, Sermons, p. 161.

meaning; occasionally a meaning so improbable, (as men account improbability), that, but for the finger of God pointing it out, we could never by possibility have discerned it; so extraordinary, that when it is shewn us, it needs an effort of the heart and of the mind to embrace it fully."

Mr. Burgon, therefore, agrees with Bishop Marsh, that occasionally at least the spiritual sense of a passage is so improbable, (as men account improbability), that it seems wholly independent of, and altogether disconnected from, the literal sense; and Bishop Marsh further acknowledges this to be the case generally with those spiritual interpretations which are to be found in Scripture itself: hence the necessity of *divine authority*.

"When,"\* says he, "we interpret a prophecy of the Old Testament, which besides its literal meaning is supposed to contain a mystical meaning, or in other words, a prophecy which is supposed to contain both a primary and a secondary sense, the grand difficulty is to ascertain what that secondary sense really is. We are not in want of a clue to determine our choice between two senses already known; but we want a clue which shall lead us from the knowledge of one sense to the discovery of the other."

Is, however, the clue to be found?

"In† every allegory there is, and must be, a clue which leads from one sense to the other. But in the interpretation of a *prophecy* to which a double meaning is ascribed, we have *no clue whatever* which can lead us from the primary to the secondary sense."

And as he treats Scripture *history* in the same

\* *Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible*, Lect. x., p. 440.

† *Ibid.*, p. 446.

manner,\* so he maintains that there is no system whatever by which we can either establish the existence of secondary senses, or by which, on the supposition of their existence, we can discover their real meaning. We must be contented therefore to resolve the question of secondary senses into a question of *authority*—yes—authority alone. The application of the sign to the thing signified does not depend, he says, upon any principle of moral fitness. It depends on the authority itself. “And since this authority is in Scripture confined to individual cases, *the doctrine of secondary senses is reducible to no system.*”

Well, then, the “spiritual sense of Scripture is one altogether disconnected from the literal sense;” for—

“If,” says Bishop Marsh,† “we endeavor to find an allegorical sense either in *history* or *prophecy*, we endeavor to find a sense with which the literal sense is *wholly unconnected*. . . . For since the secondary sense of a passage is a sense which the words do not convey of themselves, it is manifest that, as soon as we begin to trust in our own interpretation, we shall interpret *without rule or guide*. Though no passage can have more than one grammatical meaning, yet as soon as we begin to indulge ourselves in the invention of *mystical* meanings, it is impossible to say where we shall stop. We shall come at length to that wantonness of interpretation which is displayed by most of the Jewish Commentators, and by many among the Christian Fathers.”

—“In grammatical interpretation, which is an interpretation of words, there are certain rules of interpretation from which we cannot depart. But allegorical interpretation, which is

\* *Ibid.*, pp. 452—454.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 455, 454, 363.

an interpretation of things, is subjected to *neither rule nor limit.*"

Hence, according to Bishop Marsh, the necessity of literal Interpretation as introduced at the Reformation, and from that time continued in the Church of England to the present—nay, not only in the Church of England, but out of it. Accordingly, a recent author of some eminence, following the illustrious examples which have been set before him, equally with Bishop Marsh contends for a single sense :\*—

"I conceive the term *double sense* to be ill chosen, and liable to be misunderstood ; and that another expression current in some circles, *a literal and a spiritual sense*, is still more improper and pernicious."

"When† I reflect upon the difficulties, using the mildest term, which arise from an endeavor to convert passages containing matter merely genealogical, topographical, numerical, civil, military, fragments of antiquity domestic or national, presenting *no character whatever of religious matter*,—into a rule of faith and manners,—I feel it impossible to accept the conclusion ; I can find no end to my anxiety, no rest for my faith, no satisfaction for my understanding, till I embrace the sentiment that the qualities of Sanctity and Inspiration belong only to the *religious and theological element* which is diffused through the Old Testament ; and that, where this element is absent, where there is nothing adapted to communicate 'doctrine, reproof, correction, or instruction in righteousness,' nothing fitted to 'make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work,'—there *we are not called to acknowledge any Inspiration, nor warranted to*

\* Dr. Pye Smith's *Discourses on subjects connected with Prophecy*, p. 51.

† Ibid., *Scripture Testimonies to the Messiah*, vol. i., p. 54. Notes.



*assume it.* Thus I regard as inspired Scripture, all that refers to *holy things*, all that can bear the character of 'Oracles of God;' and admit the rest as appendages, of the nature of private memoirs, or public records, useful to the antiquary and the philologist, but which belong not to the rule of faith, or the directory of practice. To this extent, and to this only, can I regard the sanction of the New Testament as given to the INSPIRATION of the Old."

This is speaking out! The author tells us plainly, that a great, if not the greater, part of the Old Testament is *not inspired*. Other divines, who maintain the same principles, are not so candid: they are afraid to tell us boldly, and lead us only to infer, that many Scriptures which are commonly supposed to be inspired, are only "genealogies, official lists, family traditions, public records or popular poetry," having nothing at all to do with religion, or with what is properly called the Word of God.

Any one acquainted with the *Theologico-Political Treatise\** of Spinoza will know, that the foregoing account is substantially the same with that which Spinoza advocates; both of them confining the Word of God to that which properly belongs to the religious life, and excluding from Inspiration those parts of Scripture, which, in consequence of the method of interpretation employed, are regarded as having nothing to do with it. Into the same method of Interpretation has insensibly fallen the greater part of the Church! What shall we say then? "Here we do not find ourselves in undisguised conflict with the sceptical writers of our own time. That Scripture

\* See his Works, vol. iii., chap. xii.

has one meaning, and one meaning only, is their fundamental axiom : it is seen to be, and felt to be, one of the keys of their position."

It is obvious then from the foregoing remarks, that in these cases the literal sense is regarded as so entirely disconnected from any spiritual sense, that the spiritual sense is not even presumed to exist ; and that all distinction between the literal and spiritual senses must be abolished as "*improper and pernicious.*"

Thus has the literalism of the Reformation worked itself out into an open denial of the Inspiration of an indefinite portion of the Scriptures. *Spiritual* interpretation, even of an elementary kind, is set at defiance as "an outrage upon common sense;" and Scepticism exclaims,\* "When interpreters will heal the sick, and raise the dead, and cast out devils, we will begin to bow submissively to their alleged authority for making out a second or occult sense. Until that time has arrived, I would hope that we may be permitted to withhold our assent from their decisions, provided we find them not well supported."—What will they consider to be well supported? We offer to them the Divine Law of Correspondence. They reject Correspondence, substitute metaphor, and demand miracles. But suppose the miracles were wrought, would miracles open their eyes? One might heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, and prove the existence of, what they call, the occult sense ; but the sense would remain to them as occult as ever, nor would the opening of the bodily

\* Professor Stuart's *Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy* ; p. 20.

eyes of one person be the opening of the spiritual eyes of another. Might not the contrary effect be produced?—"For judgment am I come into the world, that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind."

Let us, then, consider the interpretations of Swedenborg in their antagonism to the views here presented; and this we shall best do by first stating the objection which is urged by the Dean of Westminster in his *Notes to the Parables* : \*—

"One, estimating (Swedenborg's) system of Scripture interpretation, thus speaks: 'His spiritual sense of Scripture is one altogether disconnected from the literal sense, is rather a sense before the sense; not a sense to which one mounts up from the steps of that which is below, but in which one must, as by a miracle, be planted; for it is altogether independent of, and disconnected from, the accidental† *externum superadditum* of the literal sense.'"

This, as we have seen, is the common objection of the literalist to any spiritual sense whatever. It is the very difficulty which Bishop Marsh urges in regard to the spiritual interpretations of Scripture, and therefore which require to be supported by divine authority: it is likewise one of the characteristics, to a certain extent, as Mr. Burgon admits, of genuine spiritual interpretation. It is not therefore at all peculiar to the interpretations of Swedenborg. We have already seen that it arises, in a great measure, from the loss of the Science of Correspondence; we now proceed further to shew, that it arises also from the reader's own state of mind, and from his being an

\* p. 41.

† See *Appendix* to our Third Tract.

entire stranger to the *subject matter* of which the internal sense principally treats.

I propose, therefore, to speak, first of all, of that mental condition in virtue of which the spiritual sense appears to be occasionally remote from the letter.

In his Commentary on the Book of *Genesis* it is remarked by Rupertus, when speaking of the Jews, that "The\* synagogue of that people who were born after the flesh, saw not by any means the *face* of the Lord, but only His *back* parts; because they saw not the *interior* things of the holy Law, where His *face*, i. e., the knowledge of God, is refulgent: when the *face* of Moses shone, they could in no wise endure it, because they beheld only the outward letter, for they were as the animal (or natural) man, who perceiveth not the things of the Spirit of God."

Here the outward and natural sense in relation to the spiritual, is regarded as the hinder part or as *behind*; and the spiritual sense in relation to the natural, as the *face* or *before*; the spiritual sense therefore in relation to the natural is a sense *before* the sense; and, therefore, when an individual objects to Swedenborg's interpretations as being a sense before the sense, he does not seem to be aware that he is objecting to them for being precisely where and what they ought to be. Surely if some of the doctrines of the Church are so above reason that they transcend our faculties, why may we not suppose that there are spiritual truths, which, as being above us, may seem to be a sense before the sense? Every good and perfect gift cometh from above, and until

\* See his Works, vol. i., p. 87, Chap. xxvi.; *Genesis* xvi. 13.

received into our minds, remains above. Divine Wisdom, flowing from the glory of the Almighty, exists in heaven separately from the letter in which it is embodied upon earth; but if the kingdom of heaven be within us, the truths which had been far above us, descending into the natural mind, descend also into the natural or literal sense. But so long as the natural man is separate from the spiritual, so long will the natural sense appear to him to be separate from the spiritual. There will seem to be no connection between the two externally, because there is none between them internally.

The objection, therefore, which has been urged in the *Notes to the Parables* is precisely that which might naturally be expected in the present age, and only indicates its religious position. For why should we think it so strange a thing, that the spiritual sense of Scripture should seem to be a sense *before* the sense, in an age which is so very far *behind* the sense? for of course to those who remain behind, any knowledge in advance of them must incur the charge of being before. Indeed the objection illustrates a spiritual state which is pointed out in the Word of God itself, and is thus described by Swedenborg :\*—

“ *And they looked after Moses until he entered into the tent.*—That hereby is signified that they see the external of the Word, of the Church, and of worship, but that it vanishes from their apprehension: this appears (1) from the signification of *looking after Moses*, as denoting to see the external of the Word:

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 10,550: *Exodus*, chap. xxxiii. 8.

for by *Moses* is signified the *Word*, and by looking *after* him is signified to see its external: for what is *before* signifies what is *within*, and what is *after* or *behind* signifies what is *without*. Hence to see the *back* parts of Jehovah, and not the *faces*, is to see what is external and not what is internal: (2) it appears also from the signification of *until he entered into the tent*, as denoting that the Word vanishes from their apprehension; for when Moses (who represents the Word) entered into the tent (that is, into the internal sanctity of the Word), he was no longer seen."

The Word as to its internal sense and sanctity was unperceived. We see then why, in the very Scriptures themselves, the internal or spiritual sense is represented as *before*, the external or literal sense as *behind*. The Jews were in the literal or external sense, and therefore relatively to them the spiritual or internal sense was *before* the sense in which they were, and apparently independent of it; a sense to which they could not mount up from below, because it seemed to them altogether disconnected from the external state in which they were; a sense, in fine, to which they could not be elevated even by the raising of the dead. Any true spiritual interpretation of Scripture would therefore be to them necessarily a sense *before* the sense, because it is a sense *within* the sense; they themselves being content to remain behind in the literal sense. Hence it is that they saw then, and see now, only the figure and the type, represented to Moses as the dark or hinder parts of Jehovah; being utterly unable to look forward to the brighter parts

which were before.—“The\* bright side of the glorious light,” says the *Family Bible*, “where it shone with its full unvailed lustre, is called the *fore* part or *face*; and the dark side, where there was a lower degree of brightness, is called its *back* part.” Thus the proclamation of the name, “*The Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth,*” as forming† the inmost sense, or bright side of the Word, was a sense before the sense; for in the Word there is truth *before* and truth *behind*; even as the Cherubim, representing the Word, were full of eyes *before* and *behind*; the eyes *before* looking into the sense before the sense, the eyes *behind*, into the sense behind the sense. “Eyes *before* them,” says a Commentator,‡ “to look to the Word of God and the deep things in it, which continually lies before them, and to the things that are yet to come relating to the kingdom and Church of Christ; and *behind* them, to observe how all sacrifices and types, predictions and promises, have had their accomplishment in Christ.”

So a Commentator on Gregory the Great;§ In the four animals “the eyes are *before* and *behind*; *before*, in order that we may examine our *internal* states and minutely consider them; *behind*, in order that with profound attention we may examine our *external* states; so as to avoid what is injurious, embrace what is useful, and thus shew ourselves to have eyes within and without.” Thus, in the case of

\* *Family Bible*, Exodus, chap. xxxiii. 23.

† See Poole's *Synopsis* on Rev. iv. ‡ Dr. Gill *in loc.*

§ Da Sylveira on the *Apocalypse*, chap. iv., p. 322.

the Cherubim, the brighter parts of the Word which are *before*, are seen by the eyes which are *before* or *within*; the darker and more external, by the eyes which are *behind* or *without*; representing the corresponding perceptive states of the human mind.

The present age, however, has just reversed the case: the brighter parts of the Word which are *before*, are regarded as the darker; and the darker parts which are *behind*, are regarded as the brighter, nay, by some, as those alone from which we receive light. It is the literal sense alone that is to them intelligible; what is not intelligible, they say, is not a revelation: and as the spiritual sense is unintelligible, it forms no part of Divine Revelation, and has nothing to do with the Word of God. And therefore the retreat of Moses into a *dark cave*, from which he might behold the passing by of Jehovah (a locality which was designed to represent the moral and spiritual condition of blinded Jews), is aptly appropriated by some Christians, in the present day, to denote their own spiritual condition.

But is there no other cause for the apparent want of connection between the literal and spiritual sense? Yes; there is that which arises from the very *subject matter* of the spiritual sense: for in seeking for this sense the light of true doctrine must be our guide.

Now, there is one doctrine which may be said to be in modern times almost peculiar to Swedenborg; I mean that of *the Divine Humanity* of the Lord.

Accordingly, the highest or inmost sense of the written Word (call it if you will "the sense before the sense") treats of the process by which the Humanity



was so united with Divinity as to be made Divine: a union which was the first principle of the union of the Divine and human elements in the Word of God, or, in other terms, of the connection between the literal and spiritual senses of Scripture. Deny this doctrine, or ignore it, and then read the account of the process of the union of the Divine with the Human, and of the regeneration of man as founded upon it, and the whole must be regarded as a device—*ut figmentum illorum non sine teste esse videatur*. For, is not the holy Catholic doctrine of the Divine Humanity treated by modern theology as a figment; and instead of it another doctrine substituted, viz., that in the person of Christ the Divine is Divine, and the human is human; that some things He did according to His Divine nature, and some according to His human; but that the Divine and human natures are really altogether disconnected, altogether independent of each other; they are two, of which the one is Divine, the other human; they are not one, Divine-Human: ‘the human nature being only the *externum superadditum* of the Divine?’ In the objection above stated, then, substitute the human nature of our Lord for the literal sense, and the Divine nature for the spiritual sense, and we have an exact description of the relation of the doctrine of the Divine Humanity to the theology of the present day. It really does stand before, and above, and aloof from, all the doctrines which are now popularly taught—nay, above all modern interpretations, as “a sense before the sense;” and the history of controversy shews that nine-tenths of the opposi-

tion to Swedenborg's interpretations arise from this source.

We have said that the union of the Divine and human natures of our Lord is a *marriage union*; and the Catholic Church in general, as also the Church of England in particular, are not without witnesses to this doctrine. For instance, on Psalm xviii. ;—

*"In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a Bridegroom coming out of his chamber ;— De thalamo, that is,"* says the *Glossa Ordinaria*, *"virginali utero, where God is conjoined to human nature as the Bridegroom to the Bride."*—Augustin.

Hilary :\*—"The *Bridegroom* and the *Bride*, is our Lord, who is God in a Body. For as the spirit is Bridegroom to the flesh, so is the flesh Bride to the spirit."

Honorius :†—

"The *nuptials* first in order were those which took place when the King of heaven adjoined to His Son Christ the *human nature*; when the chamber (*thalamus*) was the womb of the Virgin."

Dr. Jackson :‡—

"Marriage, well fitted, is a kind of music, and consists in a true consort of the stronger and weaker sex: but in this happy *marriage* betwixt heaven and earth, *between the Divine and Human natures*, the Son of God and the seed of Abraham, there is a sort of contrarieties of strength and weakness in their abstracts. He that was Geber-el, the

\* Benedictine edition, p. 735, *Parable of the Virgins*.

† *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, tom. v., 1116.

‡ President of *Corpus Christi College*, Oxford—See his works, vol. vi., p. 243, 241.

strength of God, is indissolubly linked with the weakness of man, and the flesh and substance of a woman. . . That *wisdom* in the Greek tongue is of the feminine gender, was (to the Greeks) a sufficient hint thus to transform the Wisdom of God into a goddess of Wisdom; what they spake of this goddess or daughter of Jove was most true of the Wisdom and Son of God."

Dr. Barrow :\*—

"Is mirth seasonable on the day of marriage? Behold the greatest wedding that ever was, is this day solemnized. Heaven and earth are contracted; *Divinity is espoused to Humanity*; a sacred and indissoluble knot is tied between God and man. The Bridegroom is come forth out of his chamber (*verbum Dei de utero virginali*) clad in his nuptial garment of flesh, and ready to wed the Church, his beloved Spouse. 'Let us, therefore, be glad and rejoice, for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready.'"

Dr. Pusey :†—

"Then (at the Incarnation) there began a threefold union of God with man, of which that union of marriage was the image. First, there was the union of God the Word with our flesh, whereby He *betrothed* indissolubly to Himself our human nature, joining it in one Person with His Godhead, so that God and Man is one Christ."

This union, we are told, cemented that further union foreshadowed in the *Canticles* between Christ and the Church; and this second union is imaged forth in the Church by a third, namely, the union between husband and wife.

It may naturally be asked, what is this *marriage-*

\* Sermon 1, *Nativity of our Lord*, Luke ii. 10.

† *Parochial Sermons*, vol. ii., p. 389.

*union* between the Divine and Human natures? Ought not doctrine to be founded on the literal sense of the Word ; and is it not transgressing the rule to express a literal doctrine in allegorical language? Now, I answer, if this be a transgression of the rule, then has the Catholic Church itself transgressed it ; for in speaking of the union of the Divine and human natures, the Church itself represents it always as a *marriage-union*. It remains, however, to ask on what grounds such an expression can be justified.

"It is a law of Creation," says Swedenborg,\* "that wherever there are things *active*, there are also things *passive*, and that these two should join themselves together into one."—"It is not possible," says he, "that there should exist in man either the least of thought, or of affection, or of action, in which there is not a kind of *marriage* of the understanding and will. Without some kind of *marriage* it cannot be that anything should exist or be produced. In the organical parts or substances of man, both compound and simple, yea the most simple, there is a *passive* and *active* principle which could not possibly exist therein, much less produce anything, unless they were joined together in a kind of *marriage* like that of man and wife. The case is the same throughout all Nature. These perpetual marriages derive their beginning and birth from the celestial marriage, by which an idea of the Lord's kingdom is impressed on everything in universal Nature, as well animate as inanimate."

Accordingly, Cicero speaking of the ancient Pla-

\* *True Christian Religion*, art. 472.—*Arcana Caelestia*, art. 718.

tonists, observes:\* that they divided Nature into two parts, one of which was *active*, the other *passive*. They maintained that it was impossible for matter to cohere, unless it was held together by some force; and that there could be no force unless exerted by some matter.

Hence one body formed out of two elements, the one active the other passive, is a representative of the marriage-union. In the most ancient book of philosophy extant, that of Ocellus Lucanus, it is said the universe is composed of what is active and passive. This principle it is which is the origin of the sexes, and indeed is one of the acknowledged fundamental principles of philosophy in all ages, and even of grammar.†

Unity, therefore, thus produced is composite, arising from the composition of one constituent as *agent* or active, with the other as *patient* or passive: hence in the perfect union of goodness and wisdom, goodness is the agent, truth the patient; the will is active, the intellect passive. It is in this manner, therefore, that in Christ Divine Love and Wisdom are inseparably united,—a union which, consequently, can be expressed only by a *marriage*.

Now, the doctrine of the marriage-union between the Divine and Human natures, being a fundamental doctrine of the Catholic Church, ought not to lie dormant, but to be at least of some use to an interpreter; accordingly as it is the highest or inmost

\* *Academiæ Questionum*, Lib. Prim.

† See Harris' *Philosophical Arrangements*, p. 112, 254.—*Hermes*, p. 44. Lord Monboddo's *Ancient Metaphysics*, vol. i., p. 28.

truth of the Church, so has Swedenborg regarded it as the highest or inmost sense of the Word ; and surely if the Catholic Church has thought that it constitutes the inmost sense of the *Canticles*, why may it not constitute the inmost sense of other Scriptures ? What, then, according to Swedenborg, are the great truths of which the inmost sense of the Scripture treats ? That sense teaches, that\* the Lord's advent into the world, and the union of the human essence with the Divine, was the means of saving the human race by conjoining heaven and earth ;—that unless the Lord had come into the world, and united the human to the Divine, the very perceptive faculty of good and truth would have been utterly lost to man ;—that the sensuous and corporeal principles were with the Lord as with other men, but, unlike the case with others, were gradually united to celestial principles and made Divine ;—that the progression of the Lord in the world was the progression of the human essence to its union with the Divine ;—that the Lord from His earliest infancy progressed according to Divine Order, which order is described in the Word ;—that it was by temptations and victories that the external man in Him was made Divine ;—that His progress in the union of the human essence with the Divine was according to His instruction by continual revelations ;—that the union of the Divine and human of the Lord was a mutual or reciprocal union, and hence is described as a *marriage* ;—that unless the union of the Lord were divine, it could not possibly be united to the Divine itself on account

\* See Rich's *Index* to Swedenborg's *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. *Word*.

of the ardor of infinite Divine love, in which the merely human would perish ;—that the union of the human essence of the Lord with the Divine was like the union of truth with good, and the union of the Divine with the human like that of good with truth ;—that the union of the human essence with the Divine make one God, in other words, that the Lord is God as to both ;—that by the union of the human with the Divine and of the Divine with the human in the Lord, the human became omniscient ;—that to glorify is to make Divine, and that the Lord's glorification was progressive, the progression being described in the inmost sense of the Word ;—that the glorification of the Lord even to Divine Good is described in the process of expiation ;—that the especial subject of which the internal sense of the Word treats is the Lord's Divine Human, and that the Divine *marriage* is the marriage of Divine Good and Divine Truth, thus it is the Lord in whom alone that marriage exists.

Hence, in virtue of this union of Humanity with Divinity, the Lord as to His humanity is the one object of worship ; the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, the First and the Last of the written Word of God. To him, therefore, who perceives these truths, the Temple of God in heaven is opened, and the Ark of the Covenant is disclosed.

But, compare this view of the subject with that of Thomas Aquinas, as given by Dorner ;\* and which is, at least, the one adopted by the prevailing Theology :—

\* *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, vol. ii., p. 337.

"That Thomas did not arrive at the true idea of the *Incarnation*, but even endeavored to evade it, is plain from what has been advanced; but especially clear from the mode in which he discusses the formulas, God is Man, Man is God. All the *Divine* attributes may be attributed to the Man Christ, and all the *human* to the Son of God; not, however, as though, strictly speaking, they pertained to the respective *natures*; for, strictly viewed, they pertained to the *personality* alone. The human and the divine he regards as *opposed*, not as belonging to, *compatible* with, each other. Opposites, however, cannot be predicated of one and the same thing in one and the same relation; but only in a different relation. So in the present case, opposites cannot be predicated of the person in its totality, but merely in its Divine aspect or in its human aspect. But how readily (says Dorner) does the reverse question then suggest itself,—Is it possible for one personality to be the personality of natures so *absolutely opposed* to each other? To this question, however, Thomas devotes no attention; and merely lays down the canon,—That what pertains to the one nature cannot be predicated of the other, considered in itself *in abstracto*, but solely so far as it is in the person *in concreto*. Like the Lombard, he takes especial pains to limit the proposition,—That in Christ, Man is God."

Is such the archetype of the union of Christ with his Church? Of the Divine with the human element in the Word of God? If so the whole subject is full of paradoxes. You may speak of the living and the written Word in the most exalted language, and then deny that you *really* meant any such thing; for "even the communication of the attributes, of which Aquinas speaks so much, is in his view purely *nominal*,—it did not arise from any real communication of the natures to each other." Moreover it is



only in the *Canticles* that the Church professes to find it, and a large proportion of the Church denies even this; so that according to them it is *nowhere*. Let any one read Dorner's\* *History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, and observe how very little Divine Goodness and Truth have to do with the matter; how often it is mere perplexed metaphysical wrangling; indeed we find the Church, who is the wife, disputing sometimes with respect to her husband, whether it is his *nature* that stands in the relation of husband toward her, or rather his *person*; whether his *person* may not be abstracted from his *nature*, and she may have a husband as to *person* but not as to *nature*; whether she may not worship one nature without the other, or pray to his *person* and not to his *nature*; whether, in fine, she ought to appeal directly to her husband, or only *through* her husband to some other person above him. Has the doctrine of the Divine Humanity come at length to this, that the union of the two natures results only in two which are mutually opposite, incompatible, and have *no communication* with each other? Has the Church, as the wife, no real communication with her husband? Are the Lord and the Church antagonistic to each other? Is the marriage-union between the two only a metaphysical figment? or, if not, only metaphorical? Suppose we call it metaphorical, and say,—

“*The marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready.*† Undoubtedly we may call such imagery

\* A most important and instructive work, whose relation to the writings of Swedenborg has yet to be developed.

† Professor Stuart's *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, in *loc.*, vol. ii., p. 343.

*Oriental*; for the poems of Hafiz among the Persians, and many of the religious poems of the Arabians, assume the same imagery, in order to express the ardour and purity of affection which is due to God. If any reader is offended at this, it is but the part of candor to suggest, that the Bible was written in the East, and for the East as well as the West; and surely in Oriental countries no one would think of taking offence on the ground of tropical language derived from such a source."

Well, then, if the marriage between the Divine and human natures be a metaphor, and the marriage between the Lord and the Church a metaphor, and the marriage upon earth between husband and wife be a representative only of this metaphor, it is a Providential thing for society that some security is found for the relationship of marriage, in regarding it at least as a civil contract. Into what then does this doctrine of a Divine Marriage resolve itself in modern Theology? Either into an abstract metaphysical question replete with the most paradoxical notions, into which none but the keenest wits can penetrate; or else into a mere rhetorical question which no sensible man would ever regard as signifying any reality; or else into the mere amatory theology of weak-minded enthusiasts; or lastly into an alleged revival of Gnosticism in the Christian Church. The consequence is, that the fundamental doctrine of the *Divine Humanity* has been all but excommunicated from Christianity. It is impossible to deny this fact. The essential principle of all unity in the Christian Church has been denied; and how can there be a marriage-union between the Lord

and the Church, when the very first principle of that marriage is repudiated? In other words, How can there be a marriage-union between the husband and the wife, when the very first principle of marriage is denied by the wife? Therefore I add, in the words of Swedenborg on the passage in the Apocalypse, "*Let us be glad, and rejoice, and give glory to him, for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready.*"—"When\* the Lord's humanity is acknowledged to be Divine, there is a full marriage of the Lord and the Church; for it is a known thing in the Reformed Christian world, that the Church is a Church by virtue of its marriage with the Lord."

The union then of the Divine with the Human essence is the same as the union of Divine Good with Divine Truth: the union of Christ with His Church the same as that of the Divine Humanity or Divine Truth with the love or affection of the Church in the reception of truth: the union of the Divine-human with the Human element in the written Word of God being the source of the union of the spiritual sense with the natural. It is, then, the doctrine first of the Incarnation, and secondly of the Glorified Humanity, which is the foundation of the union between the literal and spiritual senses of the Word.

In all these cases the union is represented by a *marriage*: in the highest sense, in the person of our Lord, between the Divine and Human natures: in the next, between the Divine humanity and the Church; for strictly speaking, the marriage between the purely Divine and the Human existed only in the

\* *Apocalypse Revealed*, art. 812.

person of Christ ; and if we have spoken anywhere of the union of the Church as human, with the Lord as Divine, it is only with a view to the doctrine of the marriage of the Church with the *Lamb*, that is, with the glorified humanity of the Lord, in whose person the Human is Divine.

It is this marriage-union which is the doctrinal key to the Interpretation of Scripture. Thus as Mr. Isaac Williams observes :\*—

... “The expression of God throughout the Old Testament, of being *married* unto His people, of their falling from Him being adultery, and the like, implies the Incarnation. For there would otherwise be no suitableness in such an expression; inasmuch as the relation of man to God would not be such as to admit of any resemblance of this kind, or be capable of such an analogy. But with the doctrine of the *Manhood* taken into God in Christ all is of one character, and consistent throughout. And hence the most touching appeals that are made of God to his people by the Prophets are under this figure of marriage, especially by the prophet Jeremiah. And the full force of which can only be understood by a consideration of this mystery: ‘For I am married unto you saith the Lord.’”

The union begun at the Incarnation, was completed by the Ascension ; and the inmost sense of the Word treats of the process of this union ; thus of the inner life of the Lord when upon earth, of the various states of the subjugation of the hells, and of the reduction of all things to order in the heavens, in the world of spirits, and in the Church upon earth.

\* *Beginning of the Book of Genesis*, p. 279.

To conclude :

In reference to the Science of Correspondence we have seen that there are four modes of Interpretation, which may now be arranged in the following order :—

First, the method which denies that Correspondence can be reduced to any system, confines it to the few instances expressly mentioned in Scripture (and those founded upon *divine authority*), substitutes metaphor, and virtually ignores the doctrine altogether. This method is the extreme literal, and was generally introduced at the Reformation.

Secondly, the method which pursues a middle course, and admits of a principle of Correspondence in the Word of God, not universal but partial ; the application of which is left to the discretion of the expositor, and consequently gives rise to all that discordance of interpretation which so generally exists among expositors. This method belongs to the school patronized by Dr. Van Mildert.

Thirdly, the method which rejects the middle course, and acknowledges that Correspondence is not partial but universal, inasmuch as God so created the world that all visible things might represent invisible. But the scale of representation is said to be so vast that we cannot comprehend it : that we must therefore be contented with glimpses of it here and there, and, as such, that Interpretation founded upon it can be reduced to no system. The consequence is, that interpretations in accordance with this view are partly true, and partly also conjecture. But they present a far larger proportion of genuine spiritual

truth than the method last mentioned. This method belongs to the school of ancient expositors, and those who are reviving it in the present day.

Fourthly, the method which acknowledges Correspondence as a definite system, science, or law of creation visible and invisible; comprehensible because revealed to the rational mind; and consequently reducible to definite rules. The doctrine of Correspondence is thus regarded as intimately connected with the doctrine of Inspiration: the one explains the other, and thus supplies a want which has been declared to be the most pressing want of the day; in consequence of which it claims the distinction of being, what has been called, the greatest conceivable boon to the Church. This method belongs to the writings of Swedenborg, and is regarded by those who have studied it as one of the most marvellous discoveries ever vouchsafed to mankind: a discovery not of fact, but of law or system; for the fact of such a Correspondence has been more or less recognized from times the most ancient. In the Jewish Church it was held as one of their most sacred traditions. "When God created this world," said one of their Rabbis,\* "He created it according to *the pattern of the world above*; and His reason for so doing was, that the one world might be connected with the other." This was the foundation of their belief in a literal and spiritual meaning in the Law; for they knew that the Tabernacle also was made according to *the pattern of things above*, and thus that there was a connexion of some kind between

\* *Propædia Prophetica*, by Archdeacon Lyall; p. 264.

the visible World, the Tabernacle, and the World invisible. "A moment's thought," says Archdeacon Lyall,\* "will shew that the doctrine of a concealed sense was a necessary conclusion in their minds; it was scarcely possible for them to have regarded it as the inspired Word of God, without at the same time attributing to it a meaning beyond what was conveyed by the literal interpretation." So far from this tradition being one of those which made the Word of God of none effect, it served as a medium of connexion between the literalism of the Jewish and the spirituality of the Christian dispensation. In virtue of this principle, they had no excuse for rejecting the spiritual teaching of our Saviour, or the argument addressed to them in the Epistle to the Hebrews on the ground of a correspondence between earthly and heavenly things. They knew that from within there was a divine light which shone into the outward letter of the Law; and yet, although they knew of its existence, they had no wish to know anything of its nature, and therefore the veil of mere literalism was drawn over their faces. Their spiritual state is thus described in the Word:†—

*"The children of Israel saw the face of Moses, that the skin of Moses' face shone, for the Israelitish nation knew that in the Word there was an internal sense, but were not willing to know its quality. That that nation acknowledges that there is an internal sense in the Word, is a known thing; for they say that Divine arcana are stored up therein, even in*

\* *Ibid.*, p. 274.

† Swedenborg's *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 10,705.

every syllable; but when they are told that those arcana are concerning the Lord, His kingdom in the heavens and in the earths, and love and faith in Him, then they are not willing to know. This is meant by that nation acknowledging, indeed, that there is an internal in the Word, but not being willing to know what is its quality. Wherefore also it follows, that Moses drew back the veil over his face, by which is signified, that on that account the internal is closed to them."

Believing, then, that the principles of Analogy or Correspondence have now been finally reduced to a system; that the Word of God can be interpreted according to this system; and that it presents us with a true theory of Inspiration, unfolding to us both its nature and extent, I would address myself to the three classes of Interpreters whom we have mentioned,—Those who deny the laws of Correspondence; those who believe in the existence of such laws, but regard them as only partial; and those who believe in them and regard them as universal, but maintain not that the laws, but that our knowledge of them, can be only partial, and consequently that we can form no true conception of Correspondence or Analogy as a Science, Doctrine, or System.

First, with regard to the school of Bishop Marsh. One of the more recent disciples of this school thus speaks of a work written to advocate the Law of Correspondence as taught by Swedenborg:—"Its\* object is to palm upon the world the allegorical jargon

\* *Divine Inspiration*, by the Rev. Dr. Henderson; p. 549.



of Swedenborgianism or the universally *hidden and spiritual sense*, under the imposing name of *plenary inspiration*.”—Be it so: I ask you what you have to substitute in the place of this universally hidden and spiritual sense? You reply, The prophetic writings are full of “Oriental\* poetry; pictorial, figurative, metaphorical, symbolical, and parabolical modes of representation:” that, as to the historical parts of Scripture, they are in a great measure “private† documents, genealogies, official lists, family traditions, public records, and popular poetry.” I ask you, how you reconcile this with the belief that they are divinely inspired, and part of the Word of God? You reply, that you do not pretend to do so: that Inspiration is only of those parts of Scripture which relate to religion, that a great part of the Bible has nothing to do with religion, and that for the universally *hidden and spiritual sense*, therefore, you substitute *metaphor* and *non-inspiration*.—Now, many of the Jews saw that there was a spiritual sense contained within the literal, but did not wish to see. Here we have a class of Christian interpreters who neither see nor wish to see.

I now come to the second class, who believe in a partial law of Correspondence, and partially in a hidden and spiritual sense; of these some believe in a partial inspiration, some in a plenary inspiration, of the Scriptures. Suppose we assume as the representative of this class Dr. Van Mildert, and take the case of plenary inspiration.—You say that there

\* *Commentary on Isaiah*, Introductory Dissertation, p. 35.

† Dr. Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, pp. 40, 54.

is a plenary inspiration of the Bible : that you cannot adopt the middle course of a partial Inspiration : yet you take a middle course in the case of Interpretation. What is the consequence ? you arrive at the same results as if you adopted a middle course in regard to Inspiration, for you adopt the theory of a partial Inspiration under the name of a plenary. For of what use is the doctrine of plenary Inspiration, but to educe from all parts of the Word of God the Divine element in the human, by means of an interpretation founded upon this principle ? If, then, you say there are parts in which there is no Divine element, you obviously in this case separate the human from the Divine, and substitute partial for plenary inspiration. If you profess the doctrine of Plenary Inspiration, and when you come to the interpretation of prophecy or of certain parables, assume the liberty of saying, "I do not see any deeper meaning in these words than lies on the surface," you are only using the very same expression which is used by those who openly proclaim certain parts of Scripture to be *non-inspired*. Still more is this the case, when you say of certain words spoken by our Lord Himself, that they have no meaning whatever, not even that which lies upon the surface. I say the same when you come to matters of *history* ; because in this case you also say the same, "I do not see any deeper meaning in these words than lies on the surface." So also with regard to large portions of the prophetic writings, which, notwithstanding their professedly plenary inspiration, receive exactly the same interpretations which are given

them by those who deny their inspiration altogether. The same interpretations are thus given under two different heads,—plenary inspiration, and non-inspiration; and consequently, in these cases, plenary inspiration identifies itself with non-inspiration, both parties saying the same thing, “I do not see any deeper meaning in these words than lies on the surface.”

The doctrine, then, of plenary Inspiration, as advocated by this class of interpreters, resolves itself into partial Inspiration; in so far, however, as under this head it supplies us with genuine spiritual truth, however small the proportion, it corresponds with the partial removal of the veil from the face of Moses. This class are not like the other, who neither see nor wish to see; they have advanced one step farther; they see in part, but, unhappily, have no wish to see more.

We now proceed to the Third class, who hold the doctrine of a plenary Inspiration of Scripture, and consequently of a universally hidden or spiritual sense, and this consistently and unreservedly:—

“Most surprising of all,” says one of its advocates,\* “is the analogy observable between the union of the Divine and human element in the Gospels,—and the strictly parallel union, as it seems, of the two natures, the Divine and the human element in the person of our Lord. As he was perfect and faultless, so do we deem it infallible also; without spot or blemish of any kind. We reject as monstrous any theory of Inspiration, as it is called, which imputes blunders

\* *Inspiration and Interpretation*, Sermons by the Rev. J. W. Burgon, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, and Select Preacher.

to the work of the Holy Ghost. As further, we claim for our Lord's recorded human actions mysterious significance, so do we seem warranted in looking for a mysterious purpose, a divine meaning, in every expression of the written Word. Lastly; although we may, nay we must, admit such a Divine and such a human element, we must altogether deny the possibility of separating the one from the other. We cannot separate Scripture into human and Divine. Like the Incarnate Word, the Gospel is at once both human *and* Divine, yet one and indivisible. And the method of its inspiration is as great a difficulty in its way, and as much beyond our ken, as the nature of the union of the Godhead and the Manhood in the one person of Christ."

We have already explained, that, according to Catholic theology, the union of the Godhead and Manhood in the person of Christ is a *marriage-union*—a union which is expressed not by the two separate terms Divine *and* Human, but by the one term *Divine-Human*, for the two terms Divine *and* Human express duality but not unity: this doctrine of a Divine Humanity is the foundation of a divine meaning in every expression of the written Word, *i.e.*, of a *universally hidden and spiritual sense*. We have seen that a representative of the first class of interpreters has denounced this as *Swedenborgianism*, doubtless because the only class whom he then knew to maintain these principles, were the readers of the writings of Swedenborg. This is now no longer the case: another class of theologians has sprung up, whose first principles of interpretation are one and the same with those of Swedenborg. To interpret the written Word, and thus to behold the inward and spiritual

sense, is to draw aside the veil and to be enabled to see the *face* of Moses, *i.e.*, of the Word, that is, its interior truths—a state of the Church predicted in the Apocalypse, when “*they shall see his face, and his name shall be written on their foreheads,*” viz., on the first principles of their life.

To you then allow me to say ; You are not of those who follow the middle course, or abrogate the authority of the Mosaic Laws : you admit that—

“ Full\* and pregnant was *every particle* of those laws, not only such as were moral, or seemed to have a moral end in view, but such also as might appear *ceremonial* or natural ;—replete with great things in Christ’s kingdom, of which not the slightest point or tittle shall fail. And to us it is already evident in many things, that such circumstances respecting the temporal Israel were but shadows of something more substantial, and such as have been or *are now being* fulfilled. For those institutions were, as St. Paul tells us, but images of the ‘true Tabernacle which God hath pitched and not man,’ according to that pattern of things invisible which is with God, and was seen on the Mount.”

Now we have already seen that the Science of Correspondence opens a door of entrance into the mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven, or into the Temple of the Tabernacle of the Testimony in heaven. The Temple is the Divine mystery of Christ or the Holy Scripture, the most holy hidden truths of which are now at length laid open to the Church. This is the substance of all the ancient and modern commentaries upon this passage. If then there is to be a revival of Theology in the Church, thus of the

\* *Thoughts on the Study of the Holy Gospels*, p. 271.

Church itself, it is in this direction that we must look for it; for here we are distinctly told in what the revival must consist, viz., in a clearer and more exalted knowledge of the Word of Life. It is this alone which can reunite the scattered churches of Christendom, both with each other and with the Church in heaven. It is this alone which corresponds to the opening of the Temple of God in heaven, and disclosing to view the Ark of the Covenant. Mr. Faber, therefore, is so far right when he says, that "Clearly\* some great change in the condition of matters ecclesiastical must be intended by the opening of that mystic Temple which was heretofore shut," and, that when first opened, "through the moral impediment of a thick intellectual smoke, no man can enter into it:" and yet that it is in relation to the opening of the Temple, that all subsequent judgments in the Church take place:—"Intrare in adytum," says Grotius upon this passage, "*est Dei arcana discere.*" Hence, as Mr. Pearson observes:—

"The† interior part of the Temple, containing the Ark of the Covenant, which under the Law was accessible only to the High Priest, is now exhibited to public view; emblematical of that perfect revelation of the wonders and mysteries of the great scheme of Redemption which will accompany this final accomplishment of the dispensations of God.

"In conclusion, the prophet describes the same commo-

\* *Sacred Calendar of Prophecy*, book vi., chap. iii.

† *The Prophetical Character and Inspiration of the Apocalypse*, by George Pearson, B.D., Christian Advocate of the University of Cambridge, etc., p. 175.

tions as attending this final establishment of the Re kingdom, which have been before described as attending other great revolutions of religion. Such appears the mystical meaning of the lightnings, and voices, and thunders, and earthquake, and hail, which are represented as attending the disclosure of the Ark of the Covenant in the heavenly temple."

By *lightnings, voices, and thunders*, say denborg, are signified ratiocinations; by *earthquakes*, changes of the state of the Church, here commencing; by *great hail*, falsifications of what is true and good. These things which take place in the Spiritus Sanctus have their correspondence in the natural.

"When I thought to know this, it was too late for me; until I went into the sanctuary of God I did not understand their end."—" *Donec intrem in sanctuarium Dei; id est, ad intellectum sacræ Scripturæ divinitus revelatæ, quam vocant sanctuarium, Deus in illâ loquitur, sicut in sanctuario divinis prophetis sponsa dabatur.*" Psalm lxxiii. 17. De Lyra.

---

## APPENDIX.

"In Dei Revelatione tres gradus: per *Opera*, quæ respondent *Atrio*, quia omnibus promiscue patent: per *Verbum*, quod *loco Sancto*, quia Ecclesiæ soli, destinatur: et per *Pacem*, quæ *Sacrario*, et datur solis beatis."—*Institutio Theologiæ*, auctore Francisco Turretino, tom. ii., p. 171.

The *Holy of Holies* here corresponds to that knowledge of God which is designated by seeing Him *face to face*; or the perception of the interior truths of the Word, as contrasted with the vision of the hinder parts of Jehovah representing only the externals of the Mosaic law.







# INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION :

BEING AN EXPOSITION

OF

THE PRINCIPLES OF CORRESPONDENCE, AND A SPIRITUAL  
INTERPRETATION

OF

THE FIRST CHAPTER OF GENESIS

AS FOUNDED UPON THEM.

BY THE REV. AUGUSTUS CLISSOLD, M.A.,

FORMERLY OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

No. V.

"Why should it be thought a thing incredible that God should give Law and Order to the Spiritual no less than to the natural Creation?"—*Professor Jowett on the Epistles of St. Paul.* Vol. II., p. 483; art., Natural Religion.

OXFORD :

HENRY HAMMANS, HIGH STREET.

LONDON :

WHITTAKER AND CO.

1863.



LONDON :  
MITCHELL AND SON, PRINTERS,  
WARDOUR STREET, W.

## TO THE READER.

---

"I HAVE read," says a writer to a modern periodical, "every one of the so-called Replies to Mr. Goodwin's Essay, and can state as the deliberate conviction of a man who has devoted his whole life and a great deal of his fortune to the study of physical science, that Mr. Goodwin has never been answered yet, and for the best of all reasons, viz., that to those practically competent to judge, his arguments are unanswerable."

"We do not seek," says another, "to disguise the greatness of the revolution in the Creed of Christendom, which even now is in the throes of parturition. The whole fabric of orthodoxy is founded on the first chapters of Genesis. Now if the first chapters of Genesis are proved to be of no authority, what becomes of this whole theory?"—namely, the theory concerning the Fall, Redemption, Regeneration, and so forth.

Persons who are familiar with the public press, must be familiar with sentiments of this kind; and there is every reason to believe in their wide diffusion. Even the most moderate estimate of the difficulty of reconciling Scripture and Geology is thus presented:—

"It should be freely admitted that we cannot, at

this present time, draw out a perfect reconciliation of Scripture and Geology as to the appearance of the living beings on the earth's surface. On the one hand, we are not quite sure how to read the record in the two opening chapters of Genesis; and on the other hand, Geology, in opening new truths, is at the same time ever disclosing new mysteries. But on the very face of the two records, the record on parchment and that on the stone, there is a general correspondence."—The correspondence, however, has not been sufficiently general to remove very serious doubts, and, as some think, fatal difficulties with respect to the narrative. Besides which dangers have arisen from another source, though in close connection with the system of Literalism :

"Supposing," says the *Christian Remembrancer*,\* "the results of *Criticism*, which at present are confined to books, are scattered broadcast through the country and read by the people, the frightful consequence is not doubtful. The very earnestness and sincerity of the people of England will make matters worse."

In order to avert the evils which, it is said, threaten the Church and Kingdom upon this subject, the writer of the article proposes, that an effort be made "to uproot as speedily as possible from the public mind, the Calvinistic ideas with which it is stocked," viz., upon the subject of Inspiration; and to substitute for the Calvinistic doctrine of *Dictation* by the Holy Spirit, the ecclesiastical doctrine of *Creation* by the Church. "Recent experience," he observes,

\* January, 1863 : *Relation of Calvinism to Modern Doubt*.

"has abundantly shewn that an internal intuition of the truth is not to be depended upon." Considering, therefore, the difficulties arising from Geology and other sciences, the results of Criticism, the erratic tendency of our own intuitions, and the consequent discordance even among defenders of the faith, it is declared to be high time to revert to ancient principles, and facts—for "It was a fact no less than a principle in the old Theology, that *the Church creates the Bible.*" If this principle be revived, then, it is said, the Church will not depend upon the Bible, but the Bible upon the Church; and the difficulty about "Inspiration will be only a speculative theological difficulty about which people need not trouble themselves." What prospect the Church has of recovering this supreme authority, is not stated; but so long as it was in possession of that authority, its language was that of the Jesuit Bozius\*—"They (the Reformers) have dared to assert, that Divine Scripture is of greater authority than the Church."

On reviewing the present state of things we naturally ask, What is the cause of it? and we find that, whatever may have been the theories of Inspiration, Literalism has been universally predominant: it has attempted to interpret the early chapters of Genesis, and has failed: it has attempted to interpret the Mosaic Law to the Christian, and abolished it: it has attempted to interpret the Psalms, and has regarded the introduction of most of them into Christian worship as an unchristian practice: it has attempted to explain the prophecies, and has brought

\* *De Signis Ecclesie*, p. 423.

the whole subject into disrepute, if not derision. These things are notorious. The natural result, long anticipated, has now taken place: faith in the Bible has received a shock; and many begin to ask what this Bible is, the interpretations of which have so notoriously failed. A revolution of thought has commenced, indicating a great epoch in the history of the Bible and the Church, and great changes in the relations between the two: so that the Bible will be more opened, or else it will be more closed: either alternative will be attended with earthquakes in diverse places. If, in apprehension of impending perils, the Church should attempt to make itself independent of the Bible, may not the result be that the Bible will be independent of the Church; and that then will come to pass that which is written—“*Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away?*”

Although, however, Literalism has been everywhere predominant, yet exceptions prove the rule. Dr. Sewell in his *Letter upon Inspiration*, and in his *Christian Vestiges of Creation* has intimated that, beside the literal, there may be a spiritual sense in the early chapters of Genesis. Mr. Isaac Williams, in a devotional Commentary to which we have already referred, has especially drawn attention to this view of the subject. Mr. Burgon has boldly maintained it in his sermons on Inspiration. Dr. Balfour, in a work entitled *All Nature a Symbol*, and again in another, *God's two Books, Nature and the Bible*, has advocated similar principles. But the work to which the present Tract is most indebted is *The Typical Forms and Special Ends of Creation*, by Dr. M'Cosh

and Dr. Dickie, to which deeply interesting treatise I have referred chiefly for the scientific part of the subject. With the exception, however, of Mr. Isaac Williams, it is remarkable that authors who have maintained the abstract principles of spiritual interpretation, seem to have been afraid of actually applying them to the first chapter of Genesis; for they could not do so, however correctly, without incurring the popular charge of *Mysticism*. Indeed, the whole subject of spiritual interpretation as connected with the genuine literal sense, must be studied anew, or *Literalism* will place the Church in the same position in which it has already placed Prophecy. The laws of Correspondence must be thoroughly examined, and understood—a task which will scatter to the winds the popular error, that spiritual interpretation is one and the same with *Mysticism*—that it is all feeling and imagination—and as such has no basis in objective truth. The very contrary is the fact; for whereas *Literalism*, as in the case of “unfulfilled Prophecy,” is ever appealing to the most astounding miraculous interference, the laws of Correspondence require for their basis the known facts and laws of Nature. Hence the discoveries of Science never interfere with the doctrine of Correspondence, except for the purposes of illustration and confirmation. So large an amount of ignorance, however, prevails upon this subject, that before presenting the spiritual sense of the first chapter of Genesis, a considerable portion of the present Tract is devoted to an explanation of the great *principle* upon which the Science of Correspondence is founded; if this principle be untrue, the



TO THE READER.

whole Science must fall to the ground ; if true, it will shew the coming, at this very day, of the Truth in the clouds of heaven, in power, and in great glory.

The introductory argument may be summed up as follows :—

1. That the first chapter of Genesis is a Theological, not a Geological narrative, and as such has its place in Christian Theology. 2. That there is a Correspondence between natural and spiritual things. 3. That Philosophy teaches that Man is the final cause of creation. 4. That the modern doctrine of Typical Forms and special Adaptations teaches the same truth, whence both are in harmony in this respect with Scripture. 5. The doctrine that Man, as the image and likeness of God, is the final cause not only of things upon earth but of things in heaven is the foundation of the correspondence between heaven and earth. 6. That this correspondence was known to the primæval race ; that it is the principle upon which the first chapter of Genesis was written and that this chapter forms a part of the primæval revelation. 7. The Interpretation of the chapter is thus given, to which are added the concluding remarks.

Trusting that the ensuing pages may contribute toward placing the whole question upon higher ground than that upon which it has been generally argued would conclude with hopefully asking,—

“Who can be so faithless as to doubt, that the Spirit of God is brooding over the face of the world and that out of what may seem Chaos, He will bring forth harmony, light, and power?”

*Stoke Newington, London, April, 1863.*

## INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION.

---

*"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."* Is this a Revelation? If so, is it any part of the Christian Revelation? To this question have been returned two different answers, involving two different principles of Interpretation.

First; "*Revelation*," we are told,\* "is of much wider signification than *Christianity* or the Christian religion. *Revelation* contains Christianity and the Christian religion; but it contains *more*; as for instance, the ceremonial and political laws of the Jews, the boastings of Sennacherib, the prophecies concerning Nineveh, Babylon, etc., etc. The Christian religion can only mean God's revelation of the way of salvation through Christ. Christianity may mean the same, but it may also mean a Christian's personal religion."

According to this account, Revelation contains Christianity and something more; something that is not Christianity, nor has any concern with the Christian religion. Is the first chapter of Genesis of this kind? This is one of the great questions of the

\* *Testimonies to the Divine Authority and Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.* By the Rev. Alexander M'Caul, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, etc. p. 6.

day. One answer is, that it is a part of the sacred records almost exclusively devoted to the relation of a series of physical\* arrangements. The consequence is, that the narrative is regarded as more intimately concerned with Geology than with religion; and Geology, not Christianity, has been resorted to as the test of its truth. Christians are thus turned into Geologists, but not Geologists into Christians. Thus the narrative is laid open to all sorts of attacks. The more divines labor to prove the first chapter of Genesis to be strictly and Geologically true, the more sceptics they seem to make among Geologists; till at last the narrative, being from the first regarded as not theological, and being discovered to be not Geological, either resolves itself into a nonentity, or is dependent upon ecclesiastical authority.

There is, however, another answer to the original question; viz., that Christianity is not merely a part of Revelation, but is co-extensive with it; that merely physical facts properly form, as such, no part of theological science:† that in the first chapter of Genesis are contained prophecies and mysteries concerning the creation of the Christian Church: that as Christ created all things, so all things have a relation to Him: that the Creation was in, and for, and by Him who is the Incarnate Word of God: that it cannot be understood except in Christ: that it is representative of the new creation of man in Christ;

\* *Philosophy of the Mosaic Record of Creation.* Delivered in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, by J. Kennedy, B.D., Donellan Lecturer for 1824. Vol. i., p. 7, *postscript*.

† See above, *Tract IV.*, p. 14; I., p. 45; II., p. 22.

and that it was upon this principle that Papias,\* a cotemporary of Polycarp, and Clement, with others of the Alexandrian school, gave a spiritual interpretation to the history of the Creation.

According to the first answer, Christianity is as much excluded from the first chapter of Genesis as from "the ceremonial law" or "the boastings of Sennacherib;" whence a spiritual interpretation of the narrative is regarded as absurd. According to the second, the first chapter of Genesis is concerned with the very first principle of Christianity itself; for it relates to the new creation of man, and the great end of the Gospel is the restoration of man to his primæval state. Hence there is a serious difference as to the first principles of Interpretation, consequently a serious difference as to the very character of the narrative itself. Has it any concern with religious truth, or has it not? If it has, what is the truth to which it relates? "What shall a man profit if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" If his own soul be of more value to him than the whole world, the truths which relate to the new creation of his soul should be of far more value to him than any physical facts relating to the creation of the material world; and if Geology itself be, as it is, so sublime and marvellous a science, how much more must be the truths which relate to the new creation! Is there, however, any relation between the old and the new creation?

\* *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, p. 387. By B. F. Westcott, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

"All lovers of truth," as Dean Trench\* observes when speaking of the harmonies between the natural and spiritual worlds, "acknowledge these mysterious harmonies, and the force of arguments derived from them. To them the things on earth are copies of the things in heaven. They know that the earthly *Tabernacle* is made after the pattern of things seen in the Mount; and the question suggested by the Angel in Milton is often forced upon their meditations,—

'What if earth

Be but the shadow of heaven; and things therein

Each to other like, more than on earth is thought?"

"Many," says Dean Trench, "are the sayings of a like kind among the Jewish Cabbalists. Thus in the Book of *Sohar*—*Quodcunque in terrâ est, id etiam in cælo est; et nulla res tam exigua est in mundo, quæ non alii simili, quæ in cælo est, CORRESPONDEAT.*" Here assuredly is legitimate ground for the interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis; here is announced the *Science of Correspondence*. Either the principle is untrue, and as such ought to be repudiated; or if true, its application to the first chapter of Genesis cannot be avoided; indeed in this case we only apply the same principle adopted in the interpretation of the ceremonial law, nay, in the whole of the Mosaic ritual. For, when speaking of the Tabernacle and ceremonial Law of the Jews, By those things, says Irenæus,† which were secondary, God called them to those which were primary; that

\* *Notes on the Parables*, p. 13.

† *Irenæus contra Hæreses*, iv., 14, 3. See also on the subject of *Correspondence*, Swedenborg's *Arcana Cœlestia*, 2992.

is, by things typical to the things typified ; by things temporal, to things eternal ; by things carnal, to things spiritual ; by things earthly, to things heavenly ; according as it was said to Moses, ' See that thou make all things according to the pattern of the things thou hast seen in the Mount.' For forty days was he there learning, with a view to retain in his memory, the words of God, and the spiritual images and prefigurations of things to be ; in like manner as St. Paul said, ' They drank of that Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Christ.' And again, speaking of the things foretold in the Law, ' All these things happened unto them in a figure, and they are written for our instruction upon whom the ends of the world are come.'

Now, if in the outward Universe all things continue according to the Divine Ordinance ; and are "ordered in measure and number and weight," it is of the first importance to know what is the first principle which originates this *Order* ; what is the meaning of the one in the many, and the many in the one ? We say, then, that the first principle of *Order* in Creation, whether natural or spiritual, must be sought in the *Final Cause* : that it is the Final Cause which is the essential principle of all arrangement, hence of unity ; and therefore when it is said, "Thou hast created all things, and by thy will they are, and were created," we cannot avoid the question, For what *end* was the Divine will exercised ? it being of the first importance for every Christian to know the ultimate end, or final cause of his being.

"To take away all final causes from the things of Nature,"

says Cudworth,\* “as if nothing were done therein for ends intended by a higher mind, is the very spirit of Atheism and Infidelity.” . . .

Again :—

“Neither can we banish all final, that is, all mental causality from philosophy or the consideration of Nature, without banishing at the same time reason and understanding from ourselves, and looking upon the things of Nature with no other eyes than brutes do.”

Swedenborg regards final causes as properly of a spiritual nature, but he very rarely uses the expression :† the terms which he generally employs are *end*, *principal end*, and *ultimate end*; and one reason of his being supposed to lose himself in the regions of fancy, is to be found in the very fact of his treating of these *ends*, or *ultimate ends*, or, as called by others, *final causes*, of Creation; for how presumptuous must be the intellect which pretends to a knowledge of the ultimate ends designed by the Creator! Buffon, it seems, was one of the philosophers who reasoned in this manner: “We ought,” says he, “to content ourselves with reasoning concerning things as they are. If we attempt to rise higher, we lose ourselves in the regions of fancy, and forget the narrow limits of our knowledge.” On which Dr. Barclay remarks :‡—“Such is the usual and favorite cant of those physiologists, who, under an affec-

\* *Intellectual System*, vol. iii., p. 301, 304.

† See our Appendix.

‡ *An Enquiry into Opinions Ancient and Modern concerning Life and Organization*. By John Barclay, M.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, Honorary Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, Fellow of the Royal Society, etc., etc. A.D. 1822. p. 206.

tation of modesty, repeat this stale and vulgar apology for not entering upon trains of reasoning which might lead them to a Deity or to *final causes*." . . . The consequence is, that all sorts of physical causes, most of them imaginary, have been appealed to as superseding the hypothesis of a Divinely intelligent agent, or of a future state of existence ; the one being regarded as an unknown entity, the other as an unknown state ; so that instead of a Divine agent we are referred to nature, fate, chance, necessity, invisible energies and powers, plastic virtues, formative appetencies, propensities, and so forth.

What then is the ultimate End, or Final Cause of Creation, as stated in the first chapter of Genesis ? We answer, It is the creation of man in the image and likeness of God. This being the case, it is in relation to this end that we must seek for the arrangement, the order, and unity of Creation ; and therefore, if we would understand Creation, we must first understand the principle of Order.

But here we are met with a statement which may be called a sign of the times ; for we are told,\*—"The principle of Order has been scientifically expounded only in modern times, and in regard to the animal and vegetable kingdoms only within these few years."

A very general idea of the true principle of Order had indeed existed from the Creation of the world among some of its great philosophers ; but it had always been regarded as hypothesis or mysticism : *now*, however, it seems, Science has discovered its truth, but only within these few years ; and has esta-

\* *Typical Forms and Special Ends of Creation*, p. 429.



blished the fact, that the Final Cause of Creation is MAN; and hence that it is in reference to *Man* that the Order of Creation is to be explained.

It will assist us to a clearer view of the subject if we take a brief review of the argument concerning Final Causes, as involving the principle of Order.

"The\* ancient system of Atheism supposed the organs to come first before anything farther was thought of; which organs, being all of them formed fortuitously, some of them luckily answered an end, and others answered none: those that answered, for a while subsisted: those that failed, immediately perished."

The reason for this kind of argument was, that there was no such thing as seeing before eyes were made, nor hearing before the ears, nor tasting before the tongue; consequently, that the organs came first, and the use afterwards: Chance or Nature formed the organs, and the organs formed the use. Empedocles is said to have favored this opinion.

"Lucretius† advances the same doctrine, which was indeed suitable to his ideas of the world's production. The earth, he tells us in his account of Creation, aimed at the time to create many portentous beings, some with strange faces and members; others deficient, without either feet or hands; but the endeavors were fruitless, for Nature could not support and carry them on to maturity."

Accordingly it is in contradiction to the doctrine of Final Causes that—

"He holds that eyes were not made for seeing, nor feet for walking; that he calls such explanations a preposterous and

\* Harris's *Philosophical Arrangements*, p. 122. Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, iii., 287.

† *Philosophical Arrangements*, p. 123.

inverted order ; the existence of the USE, according to him, not leading to the production of the thing, but the casual production of the thing leading to the existence of the USE."

According to this account, Final Causes have no existence: according, however, to more recent doctrines, they have an existence, but it is presumptuous to attempt to know them: thus, Des Cartes maintained that :\*—

"Final Causes ought not to be of any regard to a philosopher, because we should not arrogate to ourselves to be as wise as God Almighty is, or to be privy to his secrets. Thus in the *Metaphysical Meditations*.—'And for this one reason alone, I think the whole class of causes which are wont to be derived from the *end* to be, in physical matters, of no use; because, I think, I cannot without rashness investigate the ends of the Deity.'"

Pope entertained a similar opinion: he acknowledges, in the argument to his *Essay on Man*, that throughout the whole visible world may be observed a universal order and gradation in the sensuous and mental faculties, which cause a subordination of creature to creature, and of all creatures to *Man*; and yet he speaks of the absurdity and presumption of man conceiving himself to be the Final Cause of creation :—

"Ask for what end the heavenly bodies shine;  
Earth for whose use? Pride answers, 'Tis for mine."

Similar was the opinion of Lord Bolinbroke :—

"That Man," says he,† "is the Final Cause of the Creation, and that the communication of happiness to him is the Final Cause of his creation, are propositions most certainly false. . . .

\* Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, iii., 310.

† See his *works*, vii., 320, 310.

very reasonably, that it was made as well as for us.

Accordingly, Bolinbroke observes that, works of God one single scheme produces a multitude of different effects, and answers an infinity of variety of purposes: that to make *man* the cause of Creation, is to make a part, and the small one, the Final Cause of the whole: that ever was the Final Cause of the world, it resolved into the mere will of the Creator; could not be referred to anything without He therefore must be referred to something with Geoffrey St. Hilaire\* is said to have proceeded what further, for he reckoned it presumptuous for man to discover any end designed by the Creator. Other philosophers have maintained similar conclusions. In regard to man being considered the final cause of creation, even Cudworth observes:—

“And so† fleas and lice, had they understandin

of this lower world be well said to have been made *principally*, though not *only*, for Man. For we ought not to monopolize the Divine goodness to ourselves, there being other animals superior to us that are not altogether unconcerned in this visible Creation; and it being reasonable to think, that even the lower animals likewise, and whatsoever has conscious life, were made partly also to enjoy themselves."

With respect to "other animals superior to us," if by these be meant the living creatures called *Cherubim*, even these are represented as supporting the throne\* "upon the likeness of which was the likeness as the appearance of a *Man* above upon it." If angels are meant, they are universally represented in Scripture as in the form of a *Man*.

But are there not other animals superior to us, which may yet come upon the earth, and be instead of man the Final Cause of this world's creation? This question has been seriously asked; for, it is said :—

"Man† is the head of Creation in his present condition; but is that condition the final result and ultimate good of the progress of Creation in the plan of the Creator? As there was found and produced something so far beyond animals as *man* is, may there not also, in some course of the revolutions of the world, be produced something far beyond what *man* is? . . . Considering how vast the resources of creative power have been shewn to be, it is difficult to suppose that they are exhausted. Considering how great things have been done, in the progress of the work of creation, we naturally think that even greater things than these still remain to be done."

\* *Ezekiel* i. 26.

† *Plurality of Worlds*, p. 307, 309, 318.

Accordingly, it is intimated, that if the analogy of Science proves anything, it proves that the Creator of man can make a creature as far superior to Man, as Man, when most intellectual, moral, religious, and spiritual, is superior to the brutes. What kind of new creature this is to be, we are told no one can divine; for that as from the animal formations previous to man we could not have divined what man was to be, so from what man is we cannot divine what this new creature is to be. Be it so: one thing we know, is, that he could not be Man; for he would be as much superior to any being called *man*, as the animal creation is inferior.

Now, we are concerned with this opinion only in so far as relates to the doctrine of Final Causes, hence to the order of Creation, and, as we shall see, to the Science of Correspondence. Man, as we are told, was created in the image and likeness of God. Is there any possible order of being above this? If there be, it must be an order which transcends this image and likeness. No creature, however, can transcend the image and likeness of God, without transcending God incarnate, or God man. The series, therefore, can never go beyond man without providing a new object of worship. Nay, more; if the supposed new creature be an image and likeness of its Creator, then would there be another image and likeness as much transcending the image and likeness of God, as man transcends the brute creation—suppositions which savor of profanity and polytheism.

We are, therefore, obliged to return to the doctrine of Holy Scripture, that MAN is the Final Cause of

Creation; and this agrees with the discoveries of modern Science.

"It is evident," says Agassiz,\* "that there is a manifest progress in the succession of beings on the surface of the earth. This progress consists in an increasing similarity to the living fauna, and among the vertebrata, especially in their increasing resemblance to MAN. But this connection is not the consequence of a direct lineage between the faunas of different ages. There is nothing like parental descent connecting them. The fishes of the Palæozoic age are in no respect the ancestors of the reptiles of the secondary age, nor does *Man* descend from the mammals which preceded him in the tertiary age. The link by which they are connected is of a higher and immaterial nature; and their connection is to be sought in the view of the Creator Himself, whose aim in forming the earth, in allowing it to undergo the successive changes which Geology has pointed out, and in creating successively all the different types of animals which have passed away, was to introduce MAN upon its surface. MAN is the end toward which all the animal creation has tended, from the first appearance of the Palæozoic fishes."

Similar is the language of Professor Owen:†—

"The recognition of an *ideal exemplar* in the vertebrated animals, proves that the knowledge of such a being as MAN must have existed before man appeared; for the Divine Mind which planned the Archetype, also foreknew all its modifications." . . . "Nature, we learn from the part history of our globe, has advanced with slow and stately steps, guided by the archetypal light amidst the wreck of worlds, from the first embodiment of the vertebrate idea under its old ichthyic

\* Agassiz and Gould's *Comparative Physiology*, p. 417. See also *The Typical Forms and Special Ends of Creation*, p. 341.

† *On Limbs*, p. 86.

vestment, until it became arranged in the glorious garb of the *human form*."

Hugh Millar maintains the same doctrine :\*—

"As the veil slowly rises, a new significancy seems to attach to all Creation. The Creator, in the first ages of His workings, appears to have been associated with what He wrought, simply as the producer or author of all things; but even in these ages, as scene after scene, and one dynasty of inferior animals succeeded another, there were strange typical indications, which pre-Adamic students of prophecy, among the spiritual existences of the universe, might possibly have aspired to read—symbolical indications to the effect, that the Creator was, in the future, to be more intimately connected with his material works than in those ages, through a glorious creature made in His own image and likeness. And to this semblance and portraiture of the Deity—the FIRST ADAM—all the merely natural symbols seem to refer."

The same doctrine is repeatedly maintained by Dr. M'Cosh :—

"All animal† bodies point to MAN as the apex of the earthly hierarchy. Professor Owen tells us that all the parts and organs of *man* had been sketched out in anticipation, so to speak, in the inferior animals. . . . The simplest organism points by its structure upwards to *Man*; and man's earthly frame points to his heavenly frame, and his heavenly frame to Christ's spiritual body,—and we see that all animated things on earth point onward to His Glorified Humanity as the grand Archetype of all that has life."

"The Supreme‡ could foresee that which was to come, and which he had pre-ordained; the revelations of Geology enable us to take a retrospective view. But they do more; they

\* *Typical Forms and Special Ends of Creation*, p. 531.

† *Ibid.*, p. 545.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 340.

afford us the means of exercising a reflex faculty; we can examine the first figure in the vertebrate series, and from that point look down the long vistas which are opened, to the period when MAN appears as the final and foreseen product of the one mighty plan—the last in time, but the first in the contemplation of Him who called them all into being. Precedent vertebrata shadowed forth certain peculiarities of frame and of psychical powers, which have their full and evidently intended, significance brought out and manifested only in MAN.”

Hence it is that *man* has been called “the sum total of all the animals.” The same general doctrine is maintained by Dr. Balfour,\* who attributes to Swedenborg the merit of having prominently brought it forward, and having based upon it the Science of Correspondence. Thus, according to Swedenborg:†

...“Since *Man* is the principal end of Creation, it follows of consequence that all and everything was created for his sake; and therefore that all the properties of ORDER, both in general and in particular, were collected into him, and concentrated in him, to the intent that God by him might effect primary uses.”

...“The end‡ of the creation of the universe is, that the angelic heaven may exist; and forasmuch as the angelic heaven is the end, so also is MAN or the human race, because heaven consists of the human

\* Thus he says, with Emerson, that “Swedenborg first put the fact into a detached and scientific statement, because it was habitually present to him, and never not seen.” *Typical Character of Nature; or, All Nature a Divine Symbol*. By Thomas A. G. Balfour, M.D. p. 36.

† Swedenborg’s *True Christian Religion*. Art. 67.

‡ *Angelic Wisdom concerning the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom*. Art. 329, 327, 324.



race. Hence all things which are created, are mediate ends, and *uses* in the order, degree, and respect in which they have relation to *man*, and by *man* to the Lord."

So again :—

"All things which are created from the Lord are uses ; and they are uses in that order, degree, and respect in which they have relation to *man*, and by *man* to the Lord from whom they are."

... "There does not exist anything in the created Universe which has not correspondence with something pertaining to *man* ; not only with his affections and thoughts, but also with the organs and viscera of his body—not with them as substances, but with them as uses. Hence it is, that in the Word, when the Church and its members are treated of, trees are so often mentioned ; as olive-trees, vines, and cedars ; also gardens, groves, and woods ; as also beasts of the field, fowls of the air, and fishes of the sea. They are mentioned because they correspond, and by correspondence make one." . . .

Accordingly we are told that Creation is in a series, and that there is a unity of plan running throughout the series. The mineral kingdom is a prophecy of the vegetable :—

"Look\* at the more complicated crystals—look at the frostworks on our flagstones and windows, so like the tree in their ramifications—and you at once see that powers are operating there, which are to appear in a more advanced form in the plant. When the animal appears, it has something not in the plant—in particular, it has a power of sensation and

\* *Typical Forms and Special Ends of Creation*, p. 451.

voluntary motion; but still it retains all the power that is in the mineral, and is dependent for food on the vegetable; and so closely are the plant and the brute allied, that it is difficult to draw a line which will decidedly separate the higher forms of the one from the lower forms of the other. And when MAN walks forth to contemplate all these objects, it is evident that there is a higher principle in him, which is not in the mineral, nor in the plant, nor in the brute; but it is just as clear, that he has affinities with the lower creation, arising from the lower creation tending upwards towards *him*."

MAN, then, is the final cause of creation; and as it is the final cause which is the source of unity and order, so all creation, to be understood, must be interpreted in relation to him; and likewise, through him, to the Creator, the Eternal Logos, the Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, the First and the Last of Divine Order. Of this Eternal Logos man was the image and likeness; and therefore the Archetype of humanity is to be found in the Logos Himself as Creator, not merely as a prefiguration of what He was to become when Incarnate, but as a manifestation of what He then was as Creator of the world, viz., the Archetypal Man. Accordingly Dr. M'Caul observes :\*—

... "The language of Scripture is such as to imply that God revealed Himself to the eyes of men in *human form*."

"The Old Testament Scriptures expressly declare, that God did appear in a visible shape, and that that shape was *human*."

"From these passages, selected from the Law, the histo-

\* *Lectures on the Prophecies proving the Divine Origin of Christianity*. Being the Warburtonian Lectures, preached in the Chapel of the Hon. Society of Lincoln's Inn. pp. 35, 42, 47, 49, 54, 53, 56.

rical books, and the Prophets, it is plain as a matter of fact, that God constantly revealed Himself in *human form*, and this fact fully justifies the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation of the Deity. . . . Whether the human form was real or unreal, the fact that God selected it in which to reveal Himself remains the same."

"The *human form*, therefore, as forming a part of the Divine revelation to Abraham and the prophets, must itself convey some knowledge of the Divine nature or will. It necessarily intimates either that God did then exist in *human form*, or that He purposed so to exist in the time to come. It shews, at the very least, that the *human form* is not inconsistent with the Divine perfections; and is directly opposed to the modern Jewish hypothesis, that God is not, and cannot be united with a human form; for if this were true, it would necessarily follow, that God has revealed that mode of revealing His nature which is most liable to mistake."

"From the translators of the Septuagint downwards, it appears that the Jews understood that the Old Testament language ascribed to God a *human form*."

"Abraham's God was therefore a being who revealed himself in *human form* and with human attributes. . . . The doctrine of the revelation of God in *human form* is the universal doctrine of the Old Testament."

Thus we trace all Creation from its first beginnings through the three kingdoms of nature up to MAN; and *man* himself created to God-man uncreated.

In perfect conformity with these principles, and in anticipation of the truths of modern Science, Swedenborg observes:—

"That all things\* in the Universe were created from the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom of

\* *Angelic Wisdom concerning the Divine Love and Wisdom*, art. 52.

**GOD-MAN.** The Universe in its greatest and smallest parts, as well as in its first and ultimate principles, is so full of Divine Love and Divine Wisdom that it may be said to be Divine Love and Divine Wisdom in an image. That this is the case is manifest from the correspondence of all things in the universe with all things in **MAN**. All and singular the things which exist in the created Universe, have such a correspondence with all and singular the things of **MAN**, that it may be said that **MAN** also is a kind of Universe. There is a correspondence of his affections and of his thoughts thence derived, with all things of the animal kingdom; a correspondence of his will and of his understanding thence derived with all things of the vegetable kingdom; and a correspondence of his ultimate life with all things of the mineral kingdom."

This author accordingly proceeds to establish the relation to *man* of all and everything in the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms.

But if the Final Cause of Creation be **MAN**, how does this agree with the doctrine of *Typical Forms*? For we are told, that the principle of Order is to be found\* in the Final Cause; and again, that it is the same with "the General Plan, Pattern, or Type to which every given object is made to conform with more or less precision." What is the relation, then, between the Typical Form and the Final Cause? "Every organic object," it is said, "is constructed after a type, and is, at the same time, made to accomplish a final cause τέλος."—The final cause is the end

\* *Typical Forms and Special Ends of Creation*, p. 5, 1.

for which it exists ; but there is a series of ends, viz., an ascending series, having its termination in *man* ; and in like manner there is an ascending\* series of Typical Forms, which also terminates in *man* ; so that both the form and the end have their consummation in *man*, as the image and likeness of God ; and thus, the creation by God of His own image and likeness, hence the glory of God Himself as the Archetypal Man, is the Final Cause of Creation.

We thus see that the philosophy of Final Causes, the modern Science of Typology and Teleology, as also Scripture itself, agree in establishing the same fact—a fact the more important, because, as we shall find, it is the basis of the Science of Correspondence ; and, as it comprehends within itself the principle of the unity and Order of Creation, it identifies the Science of Correspondence with the science of unity and order ; it shews the laws of Correspondence to be laws of Creation, and thus places them far away out of the region of speculation or mysticism. It is a physical fact established by science, that the organism and functions of the human body are reflected more or less throughout creation in a series of correspondences. Shall this fact have any place or significance in our Theology ? or shall we abandon it to the materialist ? If so, let us see what is the use which the materialist makes of it. Let us take the case of a French physiologist,† whose system is thus described by Dr. Barclay :‡—

“ From observing that several species of minerals and

\* Though not chronological.

† Robinet.

‡ See his work on *Life and Organization*, p. 263.

plants resemble in their form particular organs of the *human body*; and that the species of the animal kingdom, from the zoophite upwards, make nearer and nearer approaches to *man* in form and in structure; he supposes that *Nature*, from the commencement of her operations, was solely *intent upon making MAN*; and that the regularly definite forms of minerals, plants, and the lower animals, are nothing more than the casual results of her experiments, while she was aiming at the accomplishment of, what he denominates, her *chef d'œuvre*; *the formation of MAN* from first to last being invariably the ultimate object of her ambition. What *Nature* itself is, he has not informed us; but so far as can be learned from his observations and modes of reasoning, it seems to be a certain tendency of *matter* to be organized, and to assume the human structure and form; in short, something which, like man, reasons and reflects, collects observations, and makes experiments, to improve itself in the arts and science."

"Yet\* these are not the only hypotheses of Robinet. He supposes that *MAN is the model or prototype of all organisms*, and calls this prototype an intellectual principle: by which language, if he means anything, he must mean a substance perceptible only by the understanding, like an *îdée* of Plato; and suppose that such a substance, or species of substance gives form to matter; or he must mean, what we sometimes express by the English word *idea*, a mental prototype; not properly a substance, but a plan or model conceived by the mind, agreeably to which *Nature* constructs a material organism; or, to adopt the language of Robinet, realizes the prototype by exhibiting it under a sensible form. Upon this hypothesis *the visible world is only a type of what is invisible*; and *Nature*, instead of being a blind tendency of matter, must be a principle of active intelligence. Besides, as the prototype on this hypothesis remains unaltered, and contains ex-

\* *Ibid.*, p. 272.

emplars of all the various species of forms in the animal, mineral, and vegetable kingdoms, the mere conversion of these exemplars into material or sensible forms, could not possibly furnish her with new ideas; the sensible forms being only the types of the unchanged and invisible prototypes which had been previously existing in the mind. Further, if man were the only prototype; if that prototype contained exemplars of all other organisms; and if these exemplars were first conceived in relative position, connection, number, magnitude, and proportion; it should follow, that Nature first realized her idea of *man* as a perfect whole, and then constructed animals, and plants, and mineral bodies in imitation of the several exemplars of which her mental prototype was composed. Nay, this is the view which Robinet himself has occasionally taken; when, considering the prototype as an inexhaustible fund of variety, he supposes that Nature, in serving her apprenticeship, was not so much occupied in learning how to construct *man*, as how to exhibit his form and his structure under various semblances in the animal, mineral, and vegetable kingdoms.”\*

“Accustomed,” he says, “to judge of realities from the appearances which strike our senses:—

“In this situation,†, we do not consider that the material or visible world is nothing but an assemblage of phenomena, and that there must also be necessarily *some invisible world, the foundation or substratum of that which is visible*, and to which we must ascribe whatever is real or substantial in Nature. *This invisible world is the collection of all the forces which tend incessantly to ameliorate their existence; which they ameliorate by constantly extending and bringing toward a state of perfection their several energies, in that proportion which is suitable to each of them.*”

\* See *Typical Forms and Special Ends of Creation*, p. 104.

† *Ibid.*, p. 268.

Here we have Nature in a *human form*, regarding herself as the prototype of all organisms, and modelling them according to her own exemplar; creating first an invisible world, and then a visible as the type of the invisible, the laws of which are those of amelioration or progress. The visible is indeed here the language of the invisible, but it is the language of invisible Nature; for all is Nature still, and nothing more.

We may reprobate this view as much as we please; but, if Theology refuses to find a place in her system for the discoveries of Science relative to the principle of Order, the only alternative will be their appropriation to Naturalism. Divine Goodness will be the impulse of Nature; Divine Wisdom, the laws of Nature; Divine power, the forces of Nature; Creation, in fine, will be its own Creator, and man his own God.

What, then, is the true place of these discoveries in Christian Theology? This question is of immense importance; as it will shew the advance which the Science of Correspondence has made since the times of the ancient ecclesiastical writers. Catholic Theology is thus most deeply involved in the question.

The doctrine of *Typical Forms*, then, as discovered by modern Science, has confirmed the fact, that throughout the vegetable and animal kingdoms, there is a series of organic correspondences pointing onwards from the lowest forms of vegetable and animal life to their highest consummation in MAN; so that the human organism and its functions are more or less reflected throughout every individual object of



the three kingdoms, and furnish the KEY to the order and unity of Creation.

“Researches\* into the organic portions of Nature have furnished equally beautiful illustrations of the order, and the unity of order, in Creation. The observations of naturalists; the dissections of anatomists; the classifications of botanists and zoologists, shew that in every country, every plant and every animal, and every organ of every plant and every animal, is after a type or model, and that there is a mutual affinity and a harmony among organized beings, from the lowest lichen up to the highest quadruped, and to MAN himself. It has been shewn that the whole skeleton of the vertebrate animal is made up of a series of segments, which, with an infinite number of variations, are yet homotypal; that is, of the same general form. It has been shewn, that all the parts of the flower of the plant—sepals, petals, stamens, and pistils—are after the model of the leaf; and it can be shewn that there is a homotypal *correspondence* between the leaf with its veins or ribs, and the branch with its branchlets, and the whole tree with its ramifications. These discoveries make the animal and the plant a unity throughout.”

“It may be maintained† that the lower animals are, in a sense, anticipations of *humanity*, and have appetites, instincts, attachments—as for offspring and home,—perceptions, and a sort of intelligence, which, though not identical with, are homologous to, certain of the lower endowments of *man*.”

. Another writer,‡ in his *Memoirs of a Deist*, shews

\* *The Supernatural in Relation to the Natural*. By the Rev. J. M'Cosh, LL.D.; p. 19.

† *Ibid.*, p. 154.

‡ *Memoirs of a Deist*: being a narrative of the Life and Opinions of the writer until the period of his conversion to the Faith of Jesus Christ; which took place in the course of the developments of an *Essay* to prove that pure Deism was the only true Religion (A.D. 1793), p. 178. Hatchard and Son, Piccadilly.

how he had long before been impressed with this view of the animal creation ; and how, on his conversion to Christianity, he had been led to see—

... “That all the good and evil sentiments in the heart of man were strongly portrayed in them ; not only in their peculiar dispositions and instincts, but also in the particular conformation of their bodies. That from observing their natures and actions, man might learn what was really good or bad, lovely or hateful in himself ; because all these several qualities, actions, and forms had an appropriate voice, and made their proper impressions on their corresponding originals in the human heart, and excited concordant or discordant vibrations, like those of two violins in unison, or the reverse ; so that all impressions of moral evil or deformity were immediately felt to be such, in the pure heart, by discordant vibrations, which, by causing uneasiness, or pain, self-evidently proved them to be such to its good natural sentiments, and the same inversely.”

The same is the doctrine of Swedenborg :\* who says,—“that all created things in a certain image represent MAN. This may appear from all and everything of the animal kingdom, and from all and everything of the vegetable kingdom, and from all and everything of the mineral kingdom.”

But we must now proceed a step farther in this argument.

“I have sometimes thought,” says Dr. M’Cosh,† “that the very rise in the natural from the lower to the higher, so constant, so regular, so systematic, so evidently ordained, may point to and almost guarantee, a rise from the natural

\* *Divine Love and Wisdom*, art. 61.

† *The Supernatural in relation to the Natural* ; p. 156.

This, it seems, is the principle of Order which Science in its latest advances is simply coming up to. Therefore,\*—

"Plato," it is consequently admitted, "is right when he speaks of Ideas being in the Divine Mind prior to their exhibition in sensible objects. Plato is in the right, too, when he represented sensible objects, which are ephemeral, as being constituted after eternal models. Herein, too, Plato was further right when he talked of these ideas being, in a sense, in human intelligence, and requiring only to be brought forth."

The same general principle is involved in the following statements:—

"Nature, in a large sense," according to one author,† "is the expression of a DIVINE IDEA, the harmonious whole of this world of matter and life." According to another‡—"Scientific systems are in truth but translations into human language of the thoughts of the Creator." According to another§—"The laws of Nature are the thoughts of God." According to another||—"Nature, as being the creation of God, is, as it were, an embodiment of the DIVINE IDEA; and can we be going far from the original design in such circumstances, if we seek to elicit a spiritual idea from Nature?" In this case the spiritual idea is the intermediate between the Divine and the natural.

\* *Ibid.*, p. 479.

† *Life on the Earth, its Origin and Succession.* By John Phillips, M.A., etc., Professor of Geology in the University of Oxford. p. 3.

‡ Agassiz.

§ Professor Powell.

|| Dr. Balfour, on *The Typical Character of Nature; or, All Nature a Divine Symbol*; p. 32.

But what is the meaning of "*the Divine Idea*?" This is a philosophical expression of Plato: let us translate it into Scripture language. The Divine Truth and the "*Divine Idea*" of Truth are in God essentially the same; so likewise are Divine Truth and Divine Thought. In God it is Divine Truth which thinks; for He is Divine Truth itself; and the thoughts of God toward His creatures are only His Divine Truths proceeding from Him into the sphere of Creation.

The "*Divine Idea*," then, is essentially the same with the Divine Truth: the Divine Truth the same with the Divine Reason; the Divine Reason the same with the *Logos*: the *Logos* the same with the Word; and thus Nature, as an expression of the "*Divine Idea*," is no other than an expression of the *Divine Word*, or of those Divine Truths by which Nature was created.

God, says Swedenborg, distributed all things into genera and species in order to enable man to think. If Divine Truth did not flow forth in the order of genera and species, man would be unable to think of spiritual things, thus to be enlightened by the Spirit of Truth, and to be created anew. These genera and species of Divine Truths flow forth through the heavens into the inferior sphere of the visible creation, and create the genera and species of natural things, or the external order of Nature which in itself is dead. Therefore neither scientific systems, nor the laws of Nature can be in themselves the thoughts of God. They proceed from His thoughts, but they are not His thoughts; just as words are uttered

by the thoughts, but are not the thoughts themselves.

“By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth”—all in their order. For all Order is in the Divine Archetypal Man, the Eternal Logos; and there are as many laws relating to this order\* as there are truths in the Word of God, which amount not to thousands only, but to ten thousand times ten thousand. The universe of Nature is but an expression of these truths clothed in outward material forms. In this sense only can it be an expression of the “Divine Idea.” For the “Divine Idea” is living: Nature is dead. The language of Nature, therefore, or the language of Creation, as an expression of Divine truths or truths of the Word of God, can be so only in the sense of its being a dead sign of living things, or the natural sign of things spiritual.

“Divine Truths,” says Swedenborg,† “are nothing else but the laws of Order derived from the Lord’s Divine Humanity; for all Order is from Him, thus all the laws of Order. The whole heaven, consequently also the universe, is according to those laws. The laws of Order, or the truths which proceed from the Lord, according to which the whole heaven and the universe are established and preserved, are what are called THE WORD by which all things are made: for the Word is the Divine Truth proceeding from the Divine Good of the Lord’s Divine Humanity: hence it is that all things in the spiritual world, and

\* Swedenborg’s *True Christian Religion*, art. 72.

† *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 7206.

also in the natural world, have reference to truth, as may be manifest to any reflecting person."

Plato, in his doctrine of Ideas or Types, beheld indeed these principles, but only in shadow. Vulgarly, this has been called *Mysticism*; but now it is high time to awake out of sleep! For the facts of Science have now established that\*—"There is a great truth at the basis of the ancient theories, entertained in former ages by some of the deepest thinkers which our world has produced. This truth was not correctly seized, was very imperfectly, indeed, often erroneously represented, but still *it is deep in the constitution of things.*"

To discover, then, traces of the "Divine Idea" or of "Divine Reason" in the constitution of things, is only to discover traces of the Divine *Logos*, or of the truths of the Word of God; and if so, it is only in this sense we can affirm that—

"We† have here a firm ground to stand on, in reasoning from what we know; and as there is a *correspondence* between Man's constitution and the scenes in which he is placed, we cannot be wrong in inferring, that God, by His nature and character, is led to accommodate the external world created by Him, to the intellectual nature of *Man*, also created by Him. There is a sense, then, and this a sense as grand as it is true, in which we are justified in representing these types as proceeding from the very ideas of God, from His eternal Wisdom, moved by His eternal Love."

Will any one here separate the intellectual from the spiritual nature of man, and say that the "Divine

\* *Typical Forms and Special Ends of Creation*, p. 435.

† *Ibid.*, p. 443.

Idea" of Creation can be contemplated by the intellectual apart from the spiritual nature? If so, what will be the consequence? Natural Theology will be shut up within the narrow argument that design proves a designer; or "the Divine Idea" will mean only scientific systems; and the thoughts of God, the laws of Nature. Science alone will have the credit of dealing with facts, and any theology which would grapple with the facts, would be branded as mystical.

Let us, however, see how it is possible to bring the mind out of the land of Egypt into the land of Canaan, by the very course of thought which has been designated as mysticism.

A writer before mentioned, in his *Memoirs of a Deist*, thus states the convictions by which he had passed from Deism to Christianity:—

... "I saw and felt,"\* says he, "that every man was a little world in himself, containing all nations spiritually in himself. I saw and felt that the history of the children of Israel, from first to last, was typical of what had been spiritually performed, and was still performing, in myself and all believers, who in like manner were brought out of Egypt or the bondage of the elements of this world, by the Almighty power.

"From this coincidence, which I now concluded must be general and total, between natural and spiritual things, it was again clearly confirmed to me, agreeably to the above evidence, that the whole external world, or natural Creation in our planet, was nothing more nor less than a *great image of Man*; and that all the things of it, of what kind soever, were only shadows of what was contained in *the soul and body of Man*. That the Deity in His infinite wisdom had so ordered the course of

\* *Memoirs of a Deist*, p. 178.

external Nature, as to be perfectly descriptive of, and parallel to, the course of human life both natural and spiritual.

"By this means the whole world, both visible and invisible, including the soul and body of man, was neither more nor less than a grand magazine of testimony to the Divine truths of the Bible, divided into two distinct parts; whereof one was body, or shadow, or image, and the other was the spirit, the living substance; and that the whole course of these parallels together, with equal pace, had ever been, is now, and ever must be to the end, a continual demonstration of the truths of the Law and the Gospel, by literal matter of fact, as well as by the analogy of their forms."

Such were the spontaneous thoughts of a writer in the course of his transition from Deism to Christianity; and similar convictions are clearly entertained by a modern scientific author:—

"That\* Adam must have seen in all nature," says Dr. Balfour, "distinct *spiritual truths*, seems to me apparent from the whole language employed in the beginning of Genesis, where *material* objects alone are mentioned—the garden, the tree of life, the tree of knowledge, the command, 'be fruitful and multiply,' etc.; and even when man fell, the curse seems exclusively (on any other supposition) to have been limited to temporal and earthly things; thus, the ground is to be barren, so is the woman, and the serpent is denounced. Surely, with such instances before us, we cannot for a moment believe that Adam did not most clearly read in these natural objects *deep spiritual lessons*."

Whatever may have been the case with the first Adam, we know what was the case with the Second, who always taught His disciples deep spiritual lessons

\* *The Typical Character of Nature; or, All Nature a Divine Symbol*. By Thomas A. G. Balfour, M.D. p. 84. See our Appendix.



from out of the types of Nature; and therefore, in maintaining these principles, we are only ascribing to the first Adam the same principles of Interpretation which were recognized by the Second.

This interpretation of Nature, then, is no merely mystical fancy of Plato: it is as old as Adam; and the principle of Correspondence upon which it is founded, is confirmed by the modern discoveries of Science. There is a mystery in the visible Creation both of *number* and *form* which every day is continually unfolding. "Physical science shews that *numbers* have a place in every department of Nature;" and if they have a deep meaning in the works of God, shall we deny to them a deep meaning in the Word of God?

"Surely," says Dr. M'Cosh,\* "it is presumptuous above all things in any one to condemn as mythic every part of the Bible narrative which retains a recurrent number. This principle, if followed out, would turn the discoveries of the most scientific men in modern times, the discoveries of Kepler and Newton, of Decandolle and Dalton, into myths."

As with *numbers* so with *forms*. An ordinary pine cone, says the same author, will reward the study for hours together of the very highest intellect.† An attentive study of the ratios and ordination of its spirals cannot but—

... "Tend to raise up profound reflections in the truly philosophical mind, and open glimpses to the religious mind of the deep things of God. They shew that the plant and all its members had been before the mind of God *prior* to

\* *Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation*, p. 534, 535.

† *Ibid.*, p. 128, 133. See our Appendix.

the time when He said, 'Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself upon the earth : and it was so; and God saw that it was good.' "

We may now perceive how we may pass from the natural or animal degree to the spiritual, viz., through the medium of the rational, by means of which the natural is subordinated to the spiritual. In going on then from the natural to the spiritual interpretation of the visible creation, we only apply to spiritual things the same principle of *correspondence* which modern Science has shewn already to exist in natural things—a principle which is no mere speculation, no flight of imagination beyond the region of facts :—  
"There\* is an *end* served by the Order in our world of which we can speak with confidence ; for it comes everywhere, and alluringly, and pressingly under our view. The *Order* has certainly and obviously a special respect to MAN."

This being, then, a fact established by the discoveries of modern Science, let us, with a view to bring out prominently the connection between natural and spiritual things, and the principle of transition from one to the other, carefully compare with each other the following statements :—

It is a truth now established by modern Science, but hitherto hidden from the world, that all the parts of the *human body* and everything contained therein have correspondence with such things as are upon earth ; insomuch that there is not the smallest par-

\* *The Supernatural in relation to the Natural.* By Dr. M'Cosh. p. 48.

ticle in the *body* which has not somewhat upon *earth* corresponding to it, according to the genera and species of things which exist upon *earth* : and this in such an order that all collectively represent MAN, and separately the constituent parts of *man*, so that the whole world is an image of *man*.

Compare this with the following from Swedenborg :—

“It\* is a truth hitherto most deeply hidden from the world, that all the parts of the *human body*, and everything contained therein, have correspondence with such things as are in HEAVEN ; insomuch that there is not the smallest particle in the *body* which has not somewhat in *heaven* corresponding to it, according to the genera and species of things in *heaven* ; and this in such an order, that they all collectively represent one MAN, and separately the constituent parts of *man*, so that the whole HEAVEN is an image of *man*.”

Take another statement :—

They who have not a just idea concerning *natural things*, are unable to conceive that the *human form* is the type and exemplar of their arrangement and conjunction.

Hear now the corresponding statement made by Swedenborg :—

“They† who have not a just idea of *spiritual and celestial things*, are unable to conceive that the *human form* is the type and exemplar of their arrangement and conjunction.”

Take another statement :—

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 2996.

† *Heaven and Hell*, art. 60.

It is to be observed, that all things which proceed from the Sun of the *natural world*, have some resemblance to MAN; and that consequently whatever things exist in that world have a general tendency to the *human form*, which, in their inmost essences, they exhibit; whence all the visible objects in that world are representatives of MAN.

Hear now the corresponding statement made by Swedenborg:—

"It\* is to be observed, that all things which proceed from the Sun of the *spiritual world*, in the midst of which is Jehovah God, have some resemblance to MAN; and that consequently whatever things exist in that world have a general tendency to the *human form*, which, in their inmost essences, they exhibit; whence all the visible objects in that world are representatives of *man*."

Now we ask a plain question:

Are not the statements here made with regard to *heaven* and the *spiritual man*, the very same which modern Science has made with regard to *earth* and the *natural man*? Surely, in this case Theology is but availing itself of the facts of modern Science, so that the two may be in harmony; the invisible world with the visible.—Are these things so? or are they phantasy, mysticism, jargon? Come now and let us reason together. We are here only extending the law of correspondence from the visible world to the invisible: and regarding the Creator as acting not by a partial but by a universal law. If you believe the things upon† *earth* to be patterns of things in the

\* *True Christian Religion*, art. 66.

† See our Appendix.

heavens; if you believe them to be correspondents with the body of man; how can you escape the conclusion, that all things in the heavens are themselves also in correspondence with the body of man? Think not that these are mere speculations with which you have no concern. You have at least as much concern with them as with the fact, that all things upon *earth* have correspondence with the human body; for this fact is the KEY to the order and unity of the visible creation, thus to the true knowledge of earthly things; and what if, in like manner, it be the KEY to the order and unity of the invisible creation, thus to the true knowledge of heavenly things!

Regarding MAN, then, as in himself a microcosm—the ultimate *form* and *end* of the natural world or visible creation, all natural Sciences may range themselves in their order and place in reference to him; so that all collectively may be called *human science*, not only because he may know it, but because it has more or less a relation to himself.

The same is the case with regard to the spiritual world; for both worlds meet together in him; and he may be called a microcosm in regard to the spiritual world, on the very same principle upon which he is called a microcosm in regard to the natural world.

“Since\* MAN is a HEAVEN, and also a *world* in himself, therefore in him there are a *spiritual* world and a natural world. His interiors, which belong to his mind, and have reference to his understanding and will, constitute his *spiritual* world; but his exteriors, which belong to his *body*, and have reference to his

\* *Heaven and Hell*, art. 90.

senses and actions, constitute his natural world. Whatsoever, therefore, exists in his natural world, or *earthly body*, that is, its senses and actions, are said to be correspondents of his understanding and will which belong to his *mind* or *spiritual body*."

Accordingly in *heaven*, as upon earth, all things have relation to *man* as the image and likeness of the Archetypal Man; for no created being can be anything higher: he may be more or less in that image and likeness, and ever in this respect going on to a perfection which he will never reach; but beyond Man he never can go, without going beyond what is Divine as well as Human, viz., the Divine Humanity. This being the case, it is certain that all the practical knowledge of man concerning spiritual or heavenly things must be a knowledge in reference to man as an image and likeness of God; thus to man himself as *man*; thus to the regeneration of himself as begotten by—the Word of Life, the Archetypal Man, God over all blessed for ever.

This is the whole mystery of the spiritual sense of the Word: thus of the words in the Apocalypse,\* "He measured the wall thereof . . . according to the measure of a *man*, that is, of the angel," who was himself a man. This admeasurement, moreover, is not represented as taking place in the time of that old heaven and earth which passed away, but under the dispensation of that new heaven and earth which succeeded.

We may now proceed to our last step in this preliminary argument; or to the origin of the doc.

\* Revelation, chap. xxi. 17; Ephesians, chap. ii. 15.

trine of *Prototype*, which involves the principle of *Order*.

"There\* is a *Mundus Sensibilis* and a *Mundus Intelligibilis*; and the relation in which they stand to each other seems to be as follows. To us there is first the *Mundus sensibilis*, and this, when human intelligence contemplates it, becomes the *Mundus Intelligibilis*. But when things are considered in themselves, the order, as Aristotle shewed long ago, is reversed;—to us there is first the particular then the general; in the order of things, however, it is first the general and then the particular. There is first the *Mundus Intelligibilis* in the mind of the Eternal Logos; in the fulness of time, becomes the *Mundus Sensibilis* (sense the Word becomes flesh), which is once more introduced as the *Mundus Intelligibilis*, in the mind of intellectual creation."

"If† the sensible World be an effect, of which the Cause is a Sovereign Mind, all that we may discover in effects we may fairly look for in their Causes, since here its *prior existence* is in a manner necessary."

"In‡ the Scriptural account of Creation, Light *previous* to existence, is commanded to exist: 'And God said there be light, and there was light.' So also vegetable and animal, *previously* to their existing are commanded to exist. Now whether by these commands we suppose certain orders, or, what seems far more probable, only a Divine Fiat, respect must needs have been had to certain *Pre-existent Forms*, or else such words or such volitions must have been devoid of all meaning."

"But what account then," says Cudworth,§ "can

\* *Typical Forms and Special Ends of Creation*, p. 480.

† Harris's *Philosophical Arrangements*, p. 342.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

§ *Intellectual System*, iii., p. 406.

possibly give of knowledge and understanding, their nature and original? since there must be νοητόν, that which is intelligible—in order of nature, before νόησις, or intellection.” “Certainly,” says he, “no other than this—that the first original knowledge is that of a perfect Being, infinitely good and powerful, comprehending . . . the possibilities of all things, their ideas with their several relations to one another; all necessary and immutable truths. Here, therefore, is there a knowledge *before* the world and all sensible things, that was Archetypal and paradigmatical to the same.”

“Mind or God,” says Plotinus,\* “was *before* the world; not as if it existed *before* it in *time*, but because the world proceeded from it, and because it was in order of nature first, as the cause thereof and its archetype or paradigm; the world also always subsisting by it and from it.”

Here, then, was mind before matter, the signification before the sign, the thing typified before the type; “no ectypal thing,” says Cudworth,† or that which existed after the archetypal, but itself archetypal, a kind of intellectual world which comprehended in it the paradigm or exemplar according to which this sensible world was made. The genuine spiritual significations of things, then, are not and cannot be of arbitrary origin. The type and the thing typified belong to each other by an inward necessity.‡ They were linked to each other by the very process of Creation. The earthly relation is but a lower form of the heavenly, on which, indeed, the heavenly rests, and of which it is the utterance. The relations of husband and wife existed above before they existed below; the laws of natural birth had their origin in

\* *Ibid.*, vol. i., p. 517.

† *Ibid.*, iii., p. 408, 294.

‡ See *Notes on the Parables*. By Dean Trench. p. 13, 14.



those of spiritual birth; male and female distinctions were of heavenly, not of earthly origin. The characters of Nature are not a common but a sacred writing: they are the hieroglyphics of God, intended to be a ladder leading man up to the contemplation of heavenly truth, and thus to make known to him the invisible things of God.

Thus it is, that "all we see is upon a plan,\* and that the Archetype is in the Godhead." Not that the relation between the earthly type and the Archetype is immediate, as some appear to think; but that there is an intervening or spiritual world, through which all things on earth have a relation to the Creator.

Did God say, "Let there be light?"—Whence came the light, but through the heavens from the Light everlasting? Did He say, "Let there be a firmament?"†—Above the heads of the living creatures there was beheld a firmament. Did He say, "Let the waters be gathered together?"‡ There are living fountains of waters to which God will lead us. Did He say, "Let the dry land appear?" There was a heavenly Canaan prior to the earthly,§ and trees of life which should be for the healing of the nations. Did He say, "Let there be lights in the firmament?"|| There was a Sun of righteousness which to the blessed in heaven shall never go down. Were a moon and stars set in the firmament?¶ There was

\* Professor Sedgwick's *Discourse on the Studies of the University of Cambridge*. Preface to Fifth Edition; p. 242.

† Ezekiel i. 22.

‡ Revelation vii. 17.

§ Ibid. xxii. 2.

|| Isaiah lx. 20.

¶ Revelation xii. 1.

seen in heaven a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and her head crowned with twelve stars. Did He say, "Let the waters bring forth the moving creature that hath life, and fowl to fly above the firmament?"\* There are flying eagles in the spiritual world, and living souls in the rivers and the sea. Did He say, "Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind?"† Living creatures are represented as sustaining the throne of God. There are‡ winds in the Spiritual World, and thunders, and lightnings, of which those upon the earth are only the lower manifestations. Thus the invisible creation is prior to the visible; and therefore when it is said, "We cannot argue from the seen to the unseen, unless we previously know their relation to each other," we now at length know the relation between them.

For the objective forms of which we read as existing in heaven, were not originally derived from earth; nor is it as being derived from earth that the heavenly is expressed by the earthly; for the heavenly was not derived from the earthly, but the earthly from the heavenly, as was the heavenly from the Divine. Earthly forms therefore are not their own prototypes; they are derivatives, and derivatives by correspondence; and thus correspondence expresses the very process of derivation from the Divine, that is, of Creation by God; all having reference to MAN.

Such then are the principles which we are about to apply to the interpretation of the first chapter of

\* Revelation iv. 7.

† Ezekiel i. 26.

‡ Revelation xi. 19; Psalm xviii. 10; civ. 3.

Genesis. In the words of a modern writer,\* "They are not the visionary dreams of a poet or mystic, clothing nature in forms devised by his own fantasy; they are the results reached by the profoundest inductive science of our times."

*Our times!* it will be objected; and for that very reason in the present argument worthless; for what we want to know is not the philosophy or science of *our times*, but how the narrative concerning the Creation would have been understood in the times of the *primeval man*, who, we have no reason to believe, was learned either in philosophy or inductive Science.

This brings us to the question concerning the moral and intellectual condition of the primeval race, hence to the question concerning a *primeval revelation*. All our knowledge upon this subject, we are told, can be derived only from the history of language and of ancient mythologies. And what do these teach us? The answer is thus given by Professor Jowett; and we draw attention to it, because it is the turning-point of our argument:†—

"Human beings in that pre-historic age seem to have had only a kind of limited intelligence; they were the slaves, as we should say, of association. They were rooted in particular spots, or wandered up and down upon the earth, *confusing themselves and God and nature*, gazing timidly on the

\* *Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation*, p. 521. Here Dr. M'Cosh leaves the argument; but here we take it up, and proceed to apply the principles to the interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis.

† *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans, with critical notes and dissertations*. Vol. ii., pp. 461, 462. The italics are mine, with a view to the argument in the sequel.

world around, starting at their very shadows, and seeing in all things a superhuman power at the mercy of which they were. *They had no distinction of body and soul, mind and matter, physical and moral.* Their conceptions were neither here nor there; neither sensible objects, nor symbols of the unseen. Their gods were very near; the neighboring hill or passing stream, brute matter as we regard it, to them a divinity, because it seemed inspired with a life like their own. They could not have formed an idea of the whole earth, much less of the God who made it. Their mixed modes of thought, their figures of speech, which are not figures, their personifications of Nature, their reflections of the individual upon the world, and of the world upon the individual, the omnipresence to them of the sensuous and the visible, indicate an intellectual state which it is impossible for us, with *our regular divisions of thought*, even to conceive. We must raze from the table of the mind their language, ere they could become capable of a universal religion."

"But although we find no vestiges of a primeval revelation, and cannot imagine how such a revelation could have been possible, consistently with those indications of the state of man which language and mythology supply, it is true, nevertheless, that the primitive peoples of mankind have a religious principle common to all. Religion, rather than reason, is the faculty of man in the earliest stage of his existence."

In this case, then, our first parents enjoyed a primeval *religion* but not a primeval *revelation*; and this primeval religion is thus described:—

"Probably,\* at a much earlier period than we are able to trace them, religions, like languages, had their distinctive characters with corresponding differences in the first rude

\* *Ibid.*, p. 463.

constitution of society. As in the case of languages, it is a fair subject of enquiry, whether they do not all mount up to some elementary type in which *they were more nearly allied to sense*, a primeval religion, in which we may imagine the influence of Nature was analogous to the first impressions of the outward world on the infant's wandering eyesight; and the earliest worship may be compared with the first use of signs or stammering of speech. Such a religion we may conceive as springing from simple instinct; yet an instinct higher even in its lowest degree than the instinct of the animal creation; in which the fear of Nature combined with the assertion of sway over it, which had already a law of progress, and was beginning to set bounds to the SPIRITUAL CHAOS. Of this aboriginal state we can only entertain conjecture: it is beyond the horizon even when the eye is strained to the uttermost."

True: it is only conjecture, but the most probable conjecture, as derived from the study of language and ancient mythology: a probability, therefore, which so far witnesses, as it is thought, against the truth of the first chapter of Genesis. There was, it seems, no primeval revelation; but there was a primeval religion, arising out of a primeval religious instinct, with which the rational faculties (which in this infant state of being were only potential) could not be concerned. We are therefore led to regard the primeval man as a creature of sense, endowed with religious instincts, but having no real knowledge of God; confounding himself and God and nature one with the other; capable of no distinctions between body and soul, mind and matter, physical and moral; and the subject of none of those regular divisions of thought, especially the distinctive one between the

natural and the spiritual, which the New Testament so clearly points out. "Nature,"\* says Cudworth, "is *ratio mersa et confusa*, reason immersed and plunged into matter, and as it were fuddled in it, and confounded with it:" wisdom in the mind of God being a certain separate and distinct thing. Here, then, as applied to the natural man, is presented to us the confusion—the *Spiritual Chaos*.

Granting, then, that the primeval man was, in his original state, a creature of the senses, we are told that, in early ages,† religion, like language, takes the form of sense; but that this form of sense is likewise the embodiment of thought. How does it become the embodiment of thought?‡—"Man thinks primarily by mental symbols; by pictures remembered, or created by the image-forming capacity of the mind. So far from oral or written signs being primarily the object of thought, the first artificial signs are commonly outward pictures of the inward image. The earliest words and writings coined by man were hieroglyphic." . . . When man was first created, there could have been no conventional language; and if he had to think then in the same manner in which he is said by some to think now, viz., from conventional signs, he could not have thought at all. There were then only two sources of thought which were open to him, the outward and the inward; what Nature presented to him from without, and God said to him

\* *Intellectual System*, vol. i., p. 336.

† Professor Jowett on *The Epistles*, vol. ii., article *Natural Religion*, p. 466.

‡ *Typical Forms and Special Ends of Creation*, p. 459.

from within. Before God, however, is represented as speaking to him from within, there was to him nothing but Nature without; in this case the aboriginal state of man was an external state, such as in Scripture is commonly called the psychical, animal, or natural. The question is, how he shall be brought out of the selfhood of the animal man into the selfhood of the spiritual?

In answering this question, it must be remembered that the aboriginal state was, as Professor Jowett justly denominates it, a SPIRITUAL CHAOS. But *Chaos* and *Cosmos* are correlative terms. If the *Chaos* be spiritual, so must the *Cosmos*; and if the *Cosmos*, then the *Heaven* and *Earth*. Consequently both the *Chaos* and the *Cosmos* have relation to *Man*; nay, to the very mind of *Man*: so that the *heaven* and *earth* are the heaven and earth of the *human mind*; in other words, its internal and external microcosms. Surely, then, in this case we may ask with Mr. Jowett, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible, that God should give law and order to the spiritual no less than to the natural Creation?"—"If the world had not been sitting in darkness and the shadow of death, there would have been no need of the light." So far from this primeval *Chaos*, therefore, being an argument against a primeval revelation, it is the very condition which such a revelation supposes. For if man had been created perfect all at once by the will of God, he would have been without a personality; the virtues he possessed would be no more his own, than any naturally good qualities into which men are born. Virtue, to be

virtue, must be chosen, must be an object of the will. What does not belong to the will, does not belong to the man ; nor can the man be free to choose where there is no choice. In being born into the merely natural or animal state, there is no choice ; but in passing out of it, there is ; and the narrative of the first chapter of Genesis is only a description of the process by which, in the exercise of freedom, man was brought out of disorder into order, out of *Chaos* into *Paradise*.

“ Volumes have been written on the connection of Geology with the Mosaic account of the Creation.” True : but even if there were a material Chaos as well as a spiritual,\* a Chaos of matter as well as of mind, which of the two is the proper subject of Theology ? which the most worthy of the Word of God ? Is it more important for the Church to know how the Almighty gave law and order to the material Creation, than how He gave and still gives them to the spiritual ? how out of the sensuous mind He creates the intellectual ; out of the intellectual He creates the voluntary ; out of the animal He creates the image and likeness of God ? If this be the subject matter of the first chapter of Genesis, then has the whole chapter, from beginning to end, relation to MAN—to the human animal in his infantine state, progressing gradually, according to Divine law and order, to his state of consummation as MAN, or an image and likeness of God.

This order of God, in proceeding from the lower

\* See our Appendix.



to the higher in the spiritual creation, has its correspondence in the natural creation.

“Comparative\* anatomists have traced a curious general correspondence between the growth of the animal in the womb, and the advance of animated beings in the Geological ages,—there being a progression in both cases from the lower to the higher, from the more simple and general to the more complex and special. I suppose that this correspondence arises from there being, in both cases, a like living agency acting in like circumstances. However this may be, it is certain that there is an analogy between the system of grace in the heart of the individual and the system of grace in the world. This *correspondence* arises from the life in the Church being like the life in the heart, a spiritual power in the midst of carnal materials.”

Now what is signified by these “carnal materials” in the case of the aboriginal state of man? They signify a state in which, so far from the mind being expanded with a knowledge of heavenly things, it confounds together things earthly and heavenly, itself, God, and nature; it makes no distinctions between body and soul, mind and matter, moral and physical; there being as yet no regular divisions of thought, or distinct regions of the human mind. It is ‘a land of darkness, without any *order*, and where the light is as darkness.’

In the ancient mythologies, the idea of *Chaos* and *Night*, we are told, divested of poetical imagery, is simply that of *unformed matter*, existing as the passive principle whence all forms are produced; apply this

\* *The Supernatural in relation to the Natural.* By Dr. M'Cosh. p. 278.

to the human mind, and Chaos and Night are representative of *unformed mind*, existing nevertheless in a state of passivity, out of which all moral and spiritual developments have to be produced.

In passing out of this formless state, the first process of the mind is to acquire knowledge, and to commit it to memory. But as the principles of distinction, order, and arrangement are not yet acquired, the very memory itself is in a state of Chaos. It is like the stomach, in which all things are mixed one with the other, and out of which the real aliments of the body have to be eliminated, in their proper order, by the process of digestion, etc. What then is the first state of the mind in regard to knowledge?

“The\* first state of man who is regenerated,” says Swedenborg, “or with whom truth is conjoined to good, is, that first of all in the natural man, or in its storehouse which is called the memory, there are heaped up together doctrinals of truth without any determinate *Order*. The doctrinals which are thus heaped up, may be compared to any heap of materials undigested and uncompounded, and, as it were, to a kind of *Chaos*. But this is done to the end that they may be reduced to *Order*; for whatsoever is to be reduced to *Order* is at first in this state of *confusion*. These doctrinals are not of themselves reduced to *Order*, but by the good which flows into them; and according to the quantity and quality of the good which acts upon them, such is the quantity and quality to which they are reduced. When *good* first *longs after* and *desires* these doctrinals, to the end

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, 3316.

that it may conjoin them to itself, it appears under a species of *affection of truth*."

This influx of good, as we shall afterwards see, is produced by "the Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters." In the meantime, this spiritual Chaos is described in a somewhat similar manner by the author of *Ancient Metaphysics*;—

"The\* beginning of all things," says he, "is the most difficult; and it is particularly so in this case, if we consider that all our ideas are formed from Nature. Now, what does Nature present to us? It is what may be called a *Chaos*, when everything is mixed with everything; animals, vegetables and minerals, the elements of earth, water, air, and fire; the heavens above, and the earth below. These are all perceived by our senses, which are our only inlets to knowledge in this state of our existence. But the senses perceive them altogether in the lump, and as they exist in Nature; but in order to form ideas of them, we must *arrange* them, and perceive their several *relations* and *connections*. This is done by the two great faculties of the human intellect, abstraction and generalization; that is, by *dividing* and *uniting*. As the face of Nature presents to us all things mixed with all, in which way they are perceived by our senses, it is of absolute necessity that they should be divided and considered separately; otherwise it is impossible that we should form that distinct notion of them which we call an *idea*."

We have here presented to us the first state of the human mind, even at this day, as a state of *Chaos*; but the difference between its present and primeval state, is, that primevally there was no hereditary evil, no tendency to actual sin derived from any antecedents. Whereas, in the present day, in addi-

\* Lord Monboddo, vol. iv., p. 65.

tion to the first Chaos of the human mind, there is an hereditary tendency to evil in consequence of the Fall; and, therefore, the Chaos which now is, must be more disorderly than the primeval. At the same time, the aboriginal state of man, being such as we have described, must have been that of the animal nature. In this case, the argument for the Divine Authorship\* of the Cosmogony in the first chapter, is not the least affected by the fact, that Geology shews that there were creatures of God that destroyed and devoured one another long before the time of which we are now treating; and were furnished with the natural means of so doing; for creation was not as yet pronounced good, and much less very good.

It is indeed a popular error to suppose that, in the earliest times, all animals were of a tame and gentle disposition, such as is described in the words of Isaiah, "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid;" but this arises from confounding the aboriginal state of man with his state in Paradise; whereas the aboriginal state was to Paradise what the wilderness afterwards was to Canaan, and what the natural man is to the spiritual. It was only in the Paradisaical state that man was truly lord of the creation.

Therefore when the ancients supposed, that the primordial Chaos was a struggle between the four elements, Fire, Air, Earth, and Water; and that when out of this Chaos this world was created, this

\* *Creation in Plan and Progress*, being an *Essay on the First Chapter of Genesis*. By the Rev. James Challis, Plumian Professor of Astronomy, etc., Cambridge; p. 92.

state of confusion subsisted no longer,—“I will shew,” says Bayle,\* “that, be this how it will, they ought to have excepted *man* out of their general rule; since he is subject to the most dreadful confusion and contrarieties that could have deformed the Chaos.” This author denies, therefore, that Chaos has ceased, whether in regard to man or to the elements :—

“As to the elements, 'tis their combat that renders Nature fruitful; their concord would make it barren, and were it not for the implacable war waged by them wherever they meet, there would be no generation. The production of one thing is always the destruction of another.”

And this is the state which some suppose is destined to cease when the time arrives alluded to by the Apostle,—“*For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God; for the whole creation travaileth and groaneth together in pain until now.*”

So likewise Kirby in the *Bridgewater Treatises* :†—

“When we take a first view of Nature, we are struck by a scene which seems to be one of universal conflict, for the very heavens appear not clear from the charge: the philosopher who studies them tells us of antagonist powers, that are perpetually striving with each other, the one to absorb all things in a common centre, the other to dis sever them and scatter them in illimitable space.”...

Whatever be our theories of force or motion, we can never dispense with the laws of action and passion, or action and reaction.

\* See his *Dictionary*; art., *Ovid*.

† Vol. i., p. 142.

It is, then, a mistake to suppose that *contraries* belong to the chaotic state only. The laws of action and reaction, which are laws of Nature, are laws of Order, not of disorder :—

“The\* Scripture tells us that the earth, ‘in the beginning, was without form, and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep.’ After this it became enlightened as well as replenished; replenished with various forms both vegetable and animal; enlightened by the sublime command, “Let there be light and there was light.’ In the whole of this progress we may remark CONTRARIETY; *formless* opposed to *form*; *void*, to *replenished*; and *darkness*, to *light*.”

In the contrariety of *darkness* to *light*, it is to be observed, that this very darkness may be expressed by the term *lumen*, namely, the light of reason actuated by the senses: not necessarily implying guilt, but rather that infantine state of the faculties, which distinguishes children, and is replete with fallacies which, however gross, are yet innocent. This is not reason perverted, but reason undeveloped.

Moreover, the contrariety here is not of evil to evil, but of good to evil; it is not the struggle of hostile elements remaining within the Chaos, but a struggle to escape out of Chaos. This is, therefore, a very different kind of *contrariety* from that which exists between evil and evil, or which arises from the mutual hostility of animal passions. Where there is activity there must be passivity; in one sense these are opposites one to the other; and yet if they act and react reciprocally, and thus correspond the one to the other, the result is harmony and not disorder.

\* Harris' *Philosophical Arrangements*, p. 43.

Motion, action, agitation, are requisite for health of mind as well as of body. A constant repetition of the same uniformities would end in inertness. Changes there must be, and the principle of mutation is to be found in *contraries*, such as the contrary of order to disorder.

Bearing this in mind, we may illustrate the nature of the Chaos arising out of moral evil as follows:—

“Observe,” says Bayle, “that I have considered the Chaos with regard to man, only with regard to the intestine war which every man feels individually in himself. Had I considered the dissensions which reigned between one nation and another, and even between neighbors, with all the hypocritical, fraudulent, and forcible things, etc., practised among them, I should have a very extensive and most fruitful field to confirm what I proposed to prove.”

Again : when destitute of the light of Revelation:—

“In this state, is it possible for us not to conclude that the horrors of the Chaos still subsist with respect to MAN? For to waive the perpetual struggle between the elementary qualities which prevail something more in this the human frame than in most other material beings, is there not a furious war between his body and soul, his reason and his senses, his sensitive and reasonable soul? Reason ought to suppress and calm this disorder, and pacify these intestine struggles; but it is both judge and party, its decrees are not executed, and only increase the evil.”

It has been said, that there is a very close connection between the soul and the body, and yet that they are always clashing; that they are two enemies who can never part, and two friends who can never agree; that we are composed of two enemies who

are ever at variance ; the sublime part of the human soul being ever at war with the inferior part of it. "We will go farther, says Bayle, " man is composed of a God and of a beast fastened together." In illustration of this contest he refers to the words of the Apostle—" *That which I do I allow not ; for what I would, that I do not ; but what I hate that I do. Oh ! wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death ?*"

"View but an army at the sacking of a town," says Locke,\* "and see what observation or sense of moral principles, or what touch of conscience for all the outrages they do. Robberies, murders, rapes, are the sports of men set at liberty from punishment and censure. Have there not been whole nations, and those of the most civilized people, amongst whom the exposing their children, and leaving them in the fields to perish by want or wild beasts, has been the practice, as little condemned or scrupled as the begetting them ? Do they not still, in some countries, put them into the same grave with their mothers if they die in childbirth ; or dispatch them, if a pretended astrologer declares them to have unhappy stars ? And are there not places where at a certain age, they kill and expose their parents without any remorse at all ?" etc.

I will say nothing of the abandonment of the sick to starvation and death ; of theft, revenge, adulteries, whoredoms, regarded as virtues ; of cannibalism, of the worship of gods of brass and iron, nay, even of the insane as divinely inspired, with endless other perversions and inversions of humanity ; but will any one regard these beings as MEN ? or the world in

\* *Essay on the Human Understanding*, vol. i., chap. iii., p. 9.



such cases as any other than a Chaos? What a scene for the contemplation of the Divine and the Missionary! Yet what else did the face of the earth present, when darkness covered the earth, and gross darkness the people?

“‘*I beheld the earth,*’ says the prophet, ‘*and lo it was without form and void; and the heavens and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and lo they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. I beheld, and lo there was NO MAN, and all the birds of the heavens were fled.*’”<sup>\*</sup> For the earth is *void*, when it is without men endued with virtue, of whom the land should be composed. When therefore we everywhere meet with haughty lions, tenacious harpies, ravening wolves instead of veritable *men*, does not the earth seem to be *void* and *empty*? for, as Epictetus says, ‘He is not worthy of the name of *man* who is not studious of virtue.’ Hence says Jeremiah, ‘*I beheld, and there was NO MAN.*’ Diogenes, the Cynic at Athens, when walking into the forum at midday with a lamp before him, was asked what he was about: ‘I am looking for a *MAN*,’ says he, ‘and I cannot find one.’ He therefore is the true *man* who is described in Ecclesiastes: ‘Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the all of *man*, or, as the Septuagint render it, in this consists the whole *man*. He therefore who fears God is he alone who is truly *MAN*; others, who are sots and intemperate, are but shams who wear the external mask of humanity.”

As, however, there are struggles in Chaos, so are there struggles to escape out of Chaos. The former takes place when the Spirit of God has not yet moved upon the face of the waters; the latter because the Spirit of God has begun to do so. It is in consequence of the movement of the Spirit of God,

<sup>\*</sup> Jeremiah iv. 23; A Lapide, *in loc.*

that a moral or spiritual Chaos is often a prelude to a change for the better. Where a love of the world or personal feelings are strong, beliefs erroneous, prejudices blind, there is no access to the intellect or the will except by a reduction of the mind to a state, in which not one stone is left upon another of its former persuasions. These are indeed states of deep temptation and consequent prostration; but the use to which in the Divine counsels they are subservient, is thus described by Swedenborg:—

"Before\* anything is reduced to *Order*, it is most commonly provided that there should be a general reduction thereof into a kind of *confused mass*, or, as it were, a *Chaos*, whereby the things that do not well cohere together are disunited; and when they are disunited, then the Lord disposes them into *Order*. This may be compared with what is observable in Nature, where all things, both in general and in particular, are first reduced to a kind of *confused mass* before they are disposed or arranged into *Order*. Thus, for instance, unless there were storms in the atmosphere to dissipate whatever is heterogeneous, the air would never become clear and serene, but there would be a fatal accumulation of unwholesome and deadly substances therein. In like manner in the human body, unless all parts of the blood, as well those that are heterogeneous as those which are homogeneous, did constantly and by turns flow together into one heart, and were mixed together in a *confused mass*, there would ensue a fatal conglutination of the liquids, and it would be impossible that

\* *Arcana Coelestia*, art. 842.

the particular component parts should be distinctly disposed to their respective uses. The case is the same with man in the course of regeneration."

*"And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."*

That which is here called "the Spirit of God" is in the New Testament called the Spirit of Truth, and the Holy Spirit. God being the Supreme Good, it is the Spirit of Truth which makes known to us his Goodness. We here perceive, then, the beginning of the Divine process in bringing the mind out of its state of Chaos or disorder. How is this effected? Obviously by a communication of the Truth, *i.e.*, of Order. For, "*thy law is the Truth*," says the Psalmist; and both Law and Truth have, as we have seen, a reference to *Order*. But how is the truth to be communicated? Obviously by love. And how is an affection or love of the Truth to be inspired? By a process corresponding to incubation or infusion of heat, by which a new warmth is produced, hence new affections, or, as it has been called in a general way, *religious instincts*, above and indeed opposite to the animal instincts already possessed. Hence is manifested the first appetency, desire, or affection of truth; thus the first tendency to a new disposition of things in the animal or natural mind. For unless there be produced first an affection or love of the Truth, the Truth if revealed would not be received, and the revelation would be of no use. "The light would shine in darkness and the darkness comprehend it not."—"Light, Light, more Light"—must first be the prayer of the heart before there is a revelation of

t. The Spirit of God then first begins to move on the face of the waters, when man is first made conscious of his privation or want of light; thus of emptiness, darkness, and disorder.

Now this consciousness is produced by the Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters, we propose further to explain.

We have said that God is revealed to us as the archetype of man; which He can be only as the archetypal Man, of whom the creature *man* was the type and likeness. For this reason, also, he is the archetype of Order, and hence the Archetypal Truth. Truth has reference to Order:\* "invert the terms of a simple proposition, and instead of saying that every man is an animal, say that every animal is a man, and what becomes of the truth which the proposition contained?" In any theorem derange the positions, put the last first and the first last, and what becomes of the demonstration?—What then do we say to "that marvellous arrangement existing within the Divine Mind; where the whole of Being is ever present in perfect Order, and to which no other truth is ever latent and unrevealed?" He is the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last. the Beginning in regard to God is not the same as the Beginning in regard to man. Man only exists to be, but God is Himself the Beginning of existence. Nay, man begins to be man, only when out of a state of disorder God has wrought a beginning in him. Nor is man truly man, until the end has been accomplished, of making man an image and

\* Harris' *Philosophical Arrangements*, p. 342, 345.

likeness of the Divine Order (namely, of Him who is the Beginning and the Ending, the First and the Last)—thus the sum of creation. Therefore all the ancient doctrines concerning Order springing from Disorder, Beauty from Confusion; Night and Chaos being the oldest of beings; the perfect and actual arising from the imperfect and potential, are all true in regard to the creature man; but morally false in any other sense; for Order existed before Disorder, Light before Darkness, a Divine Pleroma before void and emptiness, the Spirit of God before Chaos.

But we are told that—" *the Spirit of God moved.*"

Life and *motion*, or life and *action*, are as inseparably connected as death, and inertness or inactivity. Even the ancients spoke of two kinds of *motion*, Physical and Metaphysical. Physical motion is local, and is not that of the Spirit of Truth. Metaphysical *motion* is said to be either of the will or of the reason. In respect of the will, it is the transition from one state to another; in respect of the reason, it is the transition from one conclusion to another, or from one truth to another. Thus in respect of the will, we speak, even in common language, of emotions, motions, or motives, by which we mean certain first principles of thought and action; reasoning itself also being called *discursus*. Accordingly the Spirit of God is said to *move* us, when we pass into a new perception—a perception of what is presented to the mind as a new good; hence into the consciousness that, in relation to that good, we are in a state of privation; whence also the appetency or desire of it, for what we esteem a *good* we cannot but desire, and

whatever favors its possession we regard as *true*: thus according to the ancients,\* the cause of spontaneous impulse is the perception of absent good, either real or apparent. This is the first manifestation of the religious instinct. The Chaotic state, therefore, in so far as it implies emptiness, privation, or absence of a good, serves as the very basis of the Divine movements, without which the Spirit of God cannot operate; and thus the first result of His operations is the consciousness or perception wrought within us, that by nature, or of ourselves, we are wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked.

Hence, also, we see the agreement of this teaching with that of a sound philosophy†—"MOTIONIS enim appetentia causa est; appetentiae, privatio." It is in religious as in civil affairs: for it is to a consciousness of privation or want, that the wisdom of all ages has imputed industry, perseverance, and the invention of arts and sciences.

We now see what is meant by "the Spirit of God brooding or moving upon the face of the waters;" for the first result of incubation is the production of the *motion* of life by the infusion of heat into the waters; and the Spirit of God is said to *move*, when He produces motion in us, just as God is said to *speak* to us when conscience in us is awakened.

We are not, indeed, by the expression, "*the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters*," to suppose an immediate operation upon the human mind, without the intervention of second causes. For aught

\* *Ibid.*, p. 424.

† *Ibid.*, p. 445.

we know, there may have been some Angel of the Divine Presence, some angelic host, or Shechina<sup>h</sup>, serving as intermediate or secondary agents in bringing the natural mind out of darkness into light; for that there was present at the creation some heavenly host, God Himself is represented as teaching—*“Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth, . . . when the morning stars sang together, and the sons of God shouted for joy?”*

When therefore it is said, *“And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters,”* the general interpretation we have given of these words, is thus confirmed by the *Glossa Ordinaria* :—

“In this chapter is described the creation of the world, by which is aptly designated the (new) *creation of man*, inasmuch as man is described by philosophers, and even by the saints, as *a little world*. . . ‘*In the beginning God created the heaven,*’ namely, the *spirit of man*, which is called a *heaven* because God gave it from heaven. ‘*And the earth,*’ that is, the *flesh of man* which is called *earth* because it is under the dominion of earth. But the flesh of fallen man has not of itself any good thing. ‘In me,’ says the Apostle, ‘i.e., in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.’ Therefore it is added, ‘*the earth was void,*’ i.e., of moral good. ‘*And darkness was upon the face of the deep.*’ By the term *deep* may be signified by reason of its profundity, the *human soul*. Whence Jeremiah, ‘The heart of man is corrupt and inscrutable.’ According to another translation, ‘the heart of man is *deep* :’ nor is it any objection to this meaning that the spirit of man, which is the same with his soul, is sometimes signified by *heaven* ; for one and the same thing by reason of its diverse properties, may be figured by diverse things. For the soul, at its creation, is destitute of the light of know-

ledges; for which reason it is afterwards well said of it, 'And darkness was upon the face of the *deep*.' By '*the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters*,' is signified that the soul was naturally desirous of knowledges, which were designated by the term *waters*."

Matthew Henry furnishes a general interpretation to the same effect:—

"If the work of grace in the soul is a new creature, this *Chaos* represents the state of an unregenerated graceless soul: there is disorder, confusion, and every evil work: it is empty of all good, for it is without God: it is dark, it is darkness itself: this is our condition by nature till Almighty grace effects a blessed change."

We now see why it is that the brooding of the Spirit is represented as taking place upon the *waters*. For these *waters* are the knowledges (*scientiæ*) of the natural mind, which before were *dead*, but are now vitalized by new affections; the consequence is, they are dissociated from the senses, and disposed in a new series with a view to the discovery and attainment of higher ends, viz., of good, such as the man is capable of, from the Supreme Good. As yet, however, the mind is in a state unformed, for it is "*without form*," i. e., without ideas of good and evil: it is *void*, for in it there dwells no good thing: it is *dark*, but it is the darkness of ignorance: it is a *deep*, for all its knowledge, as being sensuous, lies *beneath or below*. On the *face* of these waters the Spirit of God moved itself; for, as we shall see in the sequel, primevally the *face* was more expressive of the affections than in the present day; so that the *face* of the *waters* (i. e., of natural knowledges, *scientiæ*) signi-



fied the first and as yet unregenerated affections from which these *scientiæ* derived their life, and which became visible, in their external form, in the *face* itself.

Here, then, we perceive the Divine preparation made by the Spirit of God for the first dawn of a primeval revelation; and are now in a condition to contemplate, from a right point of view, the origin and nature of certain mythological and metaphysical doctrines.

The ancient mythologies, we are told, discountenance the fact of a primeval revelation. But in order to prove this, how many assumptions are required! Sometimes the first chapter of Genesis is assumed to be written by Moses, and therefore its date to be later than the ancient mythologies; and since Moses was the legislator of a very ignorant, unphilosophic, and unscientific people, the narrative he wrote for their benefit is assumed to be of the same kind, borrowed rather from ancient mythologies, than ancient mythologies from it. Sometimes the narrative is referred to a later period; sometimes to an earlier, as when it is assumed to have been written in a primeval state of ignorance and superstition, many ages before the dawn either of science or philosophy. In all these cases, however, it is only the literal sense of the narrative that is received—the literal sense only that is adduced as a proof of its having been written in some infantine state of human knowledge. This is the natural consequence of a rejection of the spiritual sense; for if we regard the *spiritual* as the primeval sense of the narrative, written at a time

when the human mind expressed itself by symbols, we shall find that the narrative is full of Divine wisdom, and that the most ancient mythologies and systems of philosophy bear testimony to the remains of that wisdom.

Thus we are told that the world arose from *Chaos* and *Eros* ;\* that *Eros* first descended from heaven and separated the struggling elements of *Chaos* ; that the chaotic waters were inspired ; that they contained the *semina rerum* ; and hence that out of these waters were all things generated.

The idea of the incubation of the Spirit, says Kirby,† of its being the principle of *love* that was in action, and that it produced the first *motion*, prevails more or less in all the cosmogonies ; accordingly in that of Aristophanes, in which Love is introduced, he observes, that this is the motion infused by the Spirit into the Chaos, which is followed by light and expansion ; that hence the expression, "*He who mixed with Chaos winged and dark*," is a description of *Love*, or *motion* entering into Chaos and beginning to produce Order. Hence also certain ancient cosmogonists‡ were of opinion that Love was originally the active cause or principle of motion ; and that the Deity moved the visible heavens in virtue of His being loved by them ; love in them being the first principle of their motion.

Who does not here see the parallel between the myth and the truth ? Now if these ancient mytho-

\* Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, i., 511.

† *Bridgewater Treatises*, vol. i., pp. 367, 368.

‡ Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, vol. i., pp. 367, 512.

logies are compared with the spiritual sense of the narrative in Genesis, we are supplied with a much more satisfactory account of their origin than if compared simply with the literal sense.

The same is the case with the Phœnician Theology :

“*‘Aquam\* dixit Thales esse initium rerum (saith Cicero) Deum autem eam mentem quæ ex aqua cuncta fingeret.’* Thales said that water was the first principle of all corporeal things, but that God was that mind which formed all things out of water;—for Thales was a Phœnician by extraction, and accordingly seemed to have received his two principles from thence; water, and the Divine Spirit moving upon the waters. The first whereof is thus expressed by Sanchoniathon, in his description of the Phœnician Theology, *χάος θολερὸν, ἐρεβῶδες*, a turbid and dark *chaos*; and the second is intimated in these words, *ἡράσθη τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν ἰδίων ἀρχῶν*, the Spirit was affected with love towards its own principles;—perhaps expressing the force of the Hebrew word, *Mera-chepheth*, and both of them implying an understanding prolific goodness, forming and hatching the corporeal world into this perfection; or else a plastic power subordinate to it. Zeno (who was also originally a Phœnician) tells us that Hesiod’s *chaos* was water; and that the material heaven as well as earth was made out of water (according to the judgment of the best interpreters), is the genuine sense of Scripture (2 Peter iii. 5); by which water some perhaps would understand a Chaos of atoms confusedly moved.”

We leave to Geologists the theory concerning a Chaos of atoms, etc.: we profess to treat only of the spiritual Chaos, the spiritual heaven and earth, the spiritual waters, and the spiritual man; and we have seen how, in this point of view, man is born of *water*

\* Cudworth’s *Intellectual System*, i., 108.

and of the Spirit, that is, of the truths of doctrine, into a spiritual life imparted by them, as signified by the sacrament of Baptism. Now the spiritual Chaos we have referred to, is the reign of the senses over reason; as, for instance, "According\* to the Democritic and Epicurean Atheists, all knowledge and understanding is really the same thing with *sense*; the difference between these two, to some of them, being only this, that what is commonly called sense, is primary and original knowledge; and knowledge, but secondary or fading and decaying sense;"—so that understanding and knowledge will be but a weaker sense. This is the state of the natural mind before regeneration, and thus does life begin in death.

In ascending above these dead waters of *Chaos* we may notice the doctrine of Plato, as represented by Tertullian. For, says he,† Plato conceived that there were certain substances, supermundane, divine, eternal, which he calls *ideas*, that is, forms, exemplars, and causes of all natural and sensible things; "they being the *truths*, but the other the images." In this case, what are the immutable *ideas* or *forms* of Plato, but the Divine creative truths flowing forth from the Word which created and sustains all things? And again, what the *animating forms* of Aristotle but the same?

"It‡ is to the diversity of powers in these *animating forms*," says Mr. Harris, "that the diversities in the organizations of the corporeal world have reference. . . . It is here we behold *the harmony between the visible world and the*

\* Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, iv., 117. † *Ibid.*, iii., 66.

‡ *Philosophical Arrangements*, p. 98, 106. See our Appendix.

*invisible*; between the passive and the active; between the lifeless and the living. The whole variety in bodies, as we natural as artificial, is solely referable to the previous variety in these their *animating forms*. . . . The *animating form* of a natural body is neither its organization, nor its figure, nor any other of those inferior forms which make up the system of its visible qualities; but it is the power, which, not being that organization, nor that figure, nor those qualities, is yet able to produce, to preserve, and to employ them. It is, therefore, the power which first moves and then conducts that latent process by which the acorn becomes an oak, the *embryo* becomes a *man*. . . . With *man* it is that superior and more noble faculty, which by its own divine vigor . . . makes and denominates him a being *intellective* and *rational*."

How it is that man from being an animal is made intellective and rational, or from beginning in sense is made to end in reason, it is the object of the spiritual interpretation of this chapter to shew; consequently the *modus agendi* or way in which this is effected by the Spirit of God. It is in this respect that *Christian Anthropology* differs from every other science philosophy of the human mind. The time will come when the subject will be thought to be practical though it is not apt to be considered so now. Christian life in the present day has no philosophical sudden changes, whether effected by an external ceremonial, or an internal incomprehensible power have contributed to supersede the idea of law, and order; and to place the *modus agendi* of the Spirit of Truth in elevating man from the senses to the reason, beyond the reach of investigation more, to class the whole process with man's

magination. Hence the influences of the Holy Spirit are regarded in the light of miracle, transcending all ideas of order or law. Such is the degradation into which has fallen the most exalted and practical subject that can possibly engage the human mind. The consequences have shewn themselves in morals on the one hand, and every form of Doubt and infidelity on the other.

Let us proceed:

What is it that degrades man, and causes him to apostatize toward the brute? Setting up sense above reason, intellect; sight above faith; this world above the next. Science teaches us, that those faculties of our nature that are not cultivated, become most acute: if intellectual pursuits are neglected, the intellect itself becomes weakened: in proportion as the senses are exercised, they are strengthened; in proportion as the pleasures they afford us stand high on our estimation, we graduate toward the brute which has no pleasures but those of sense, or toward the angel who knows no pleasures but what are spiritual. *There is a ruling principle in man, originally enthroned in him by his Creator*, and to whose sway the senses were originally in subjection. But when man fell, a struggle was instituted, the lower or sensual part of his nature striving to take the rule over him, and to dethrone the higher or intellectual. This is the 'law in our members warring against the law of our mind,' mentioned by the Apostle. Now, we know the same individual, at different periods of life, may be actuated in his actions first by one and then by the other of these laws: he may begin in sense, and end in spirit, or vice versa. If the former takes place in him, his nature and character are elevated, and he is become more intellectual:

\* Kirby's *Bridgewater Treatises*, vol. i., p. 82.

if the latter, they are degraded, and he is become more sensual and nearer to a brute; and yet in both cases he remains the same man as before: his species is not altered."

Now what is here meant by "*the governing principle in man originally enthroned in him by the Creator?*" Clearly the same with the "animating form" or "animating power" of the ancient philosophy;\* and what is this, when expressed in Scripture language, but the same with the Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters: truth or reason operating upon sense, or upon the knowledges derived from sense? How this is effected, we have already seen. First, there is the perception of a higher good, or a perception that the good already possessed is not a good, which is often effected in the present day by the loss of that good which we esteemed to be such; then follows the perception of a want, or of a state of void or emptiness; then the appetency, or onward tendency to that good which we are conscious we do not possess. The highest form of good to the rational faculty, in this state, is *truth*.

"'Tis† here then we behold the meaning of an ancient and important doctrine, that the primary objects of *perception* and *volition* are the same. 'Tis hence also we may learn that not only all GOOD is TRUTH, but also that all TRUTH is GOD, as it is the sole pursuit of the contemplative, the natural object of their wants, equally as honors are to the ambitious, or as banquets to the luxurious."

We may here, too, understand the true meaning of that ancient adage, *Nihil in intellectu quod non prius*

\* See our Appendix.

† *Philosophical Arrangements*, p. 430.

*in sensu*; for unquestionably man is in the sensuous state before he is in the rational. He passes into the rational not by allowing the senses to take possession of the reason; but by the perception of a good which the senses cannot perceive, and hence of a want which they cannot supply. Truth and good are to the rational faculties of the mind, what the objects of Nature are to the senses; and if the perception of these objects depends upon the organic structure of the bodily organs, so do the perceptions of good and truth, upon the organic structure of the mind. And indeed *vice versâ*; for if there were no light, the eye would grow too weak to behold it; and it would be all the same to the man as if he had no eyes: and, if there were no truth or nothing which he could believe to be truth, the rational sight would see nothing, and the organ of mental vision be useless, and ultimately disappear, having no function.

To place, therefore, "religious instincts" on the same ground with natural instincts, and then to say that natural instincts are beyond the reach of investigation; consequently, that both are to be regarded as axioms\* or as ultimate facts which constitute the boundaries of enquiry and intelligence: that with respect to man they are hypotheses on which he is compelled to act and compelled to reason, the Deity having willed it, from as blind an instinct as any that actuates the lower animals, and that this it is to walk by faith and not by sight: this, I say, is very natural for those who believe this chapter to be a Geological record, and have no sight by which to discern the

\* Barclay on *Life and Organization*, p. 285.



meaning of "the Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters."

In the primevally sensuous state, we cannot, indeed, say there was any persistent attempt to set up sense above reason; for reason had not as yet been distinguished from the senses. The aboriginals were so far therefore in a state of innocence; but it was the innocency of children in whom the rational powers had not yet been developed; and though we cannot conceive how the reason, when developed, could gain the ascendancy over the senses without a struggle, and this a severe one, yet there was nothing in the result to indicate a retrograde motion. Whatever took place was in the line of progression from death to life, from a lower life to a higher, from *evening* to *morning*; a progressiveness which is manifest upon the face of the narrative. It is only in the third chapter that retrogression begins.

3. "*And God said*"—An expression which indicates language, spoken too not by the creature, but by the Creator. Are we to presume that a language already existed, and that the Creator himself employed it in giving his commands? The expression certainly implies a spoken language; but what are we to understand by a language spoken by the Creator? It has been said, that *thought* is internal *speech*, and *speech* the external of *thought*. "To\* think is to speak low; to speak is to think aloud. The word is the thought incarnate." And in like manner as the Eternal Word existed as the Word before being incarnate, so in man the Word may exist as thought

\* *Science of Language*. By Professor Max Müller. p. 391.

without being incarnate. In this case, the word *spoken* signifies the word *thought*; and hence when man thinks from God, God is represented as speaking to him, or as speaking within him, as the Angel did who spake in Zachariah; and as God is represented as speaking in the present day, when conscience is represented as the voice of God in the soul.

As then, in the previous verse, the Spirit of God was described as moving upon the face of the waters, when he was effecting motions in the mind, and thus originating new motives; so, in the present case, when these interior motives become the moving or animating forms of the knowledge acquired, God is said to speak to man, because man himself thinks from God, and thought is internal speech. This is the meaning, even in the present day, of the Spirit of God communing with man, and of man communing with the Spirit of God in prayer.

There is, then, internal language as well as external; and what is communicated from God to man by this internal language, is what is signified by the expression, “*and God said.*” This internal language becomes external when it selects the objects of the senses, conveyed to the imagination, as external symbols. In this case, if the man thinks from symbols, it is only in the sense of his first beholding the objects of Nature, and these objects then serving as a basis for corresponding spiritual thoughts; as in the case of our Lord himself. Thus there is an internal speech in an external speech; an internal language in an external language; an internal mean-

ing in the external symbol; for the external symbol is the external language.

But if this explains the language of God to man, how does it explain the language of man to man? Must not *this* language at least have been either phonetic, or written, or both? We answer: There is (or was rather) another language besides these two, neither written, nor phonetic, but more expressive than either.—“We,\* having language at our command, have neglected the art of speaking without words; but in the South of Europe that art is still preserved. If it be true that *one look may speak volumes*, it is clear that we might save ourselves much of the trouble entailed by the use of *discursive speech*.” Accordingly, in the primeval race, the face was made the mirror of the celestial fire and light of interior life; and thus the language of the face was the primeval language.

The question, therefore, concerning the origin of language, which, in consequence of modern scientific investigations, has been the cause of so much perplexity in the minds of the learned, is thus satisfactorily answered by Swedenborg:†—

“What has heretofore been unknown to the world, and will perhaps appear incredible, the man of the Most Ancient Church (the Adamic) had internal respiration, and none external but what was tacit and imperceptible; wherefore they did not converse so much by expressions of speech, as was the case afterwards and at this day, but by ideas, like the angels,

\* *Science of Language*. By Professor Max Müller. p. 375.

† *Arcana Cælestia*, art. 607.

which ideas they were able to express by numberless changes of the *countenance* and *face*, and especially of the *lips*, in which there are innumerable series of muscular fibres, at this day not extricated or unfolded, but which at that time being free and unfolded, served them as means to suggest, signify, and represent their ideas in such a manner, that they could express in a minute of time what at this day could not be expressed by articulate sounds and words under an hour; and such expression was much more full, and conveyed to the apprehension and understanding a more clear idea, than it is possible can be conveyed by language and a series of combined words. This perhaps is incredible, but nevertheless it is true."

We may thus more clearly understand the remark of Professor Max Muller, when he says that "if *one look* may speak *volumes*, it is clear that we might save ourselves much of the trouble entailed by the use of *discursive speech*." Indeed, historic traces of this primeval language are obvious throughout the pages both of the Old and New Testament. "A man's wisdom," says the Preacher,\* "maketh his *face* to shine;" hence, in the case of Moses, the skin of his *face* is said to have shone. Hence also the invitation, "Seek ye my *face*," and the response, "Thy *face* Lord will I seek."—"Turn not away the *face* of thine anointed."—"The Lord will not turn away his *face* from you."—"I entreated thy *face* with

\* Eccl. viii. 1; Psalm xxvii. 8; 2 Chron. xxx. 9; Psalm cxix. 58; Proverbs xxi. 29; Jer. v. 3; xviii. 17; Psalm xiii. 1; xxxiv. 16; Joel ii. 6; Psalm xiii. 8; lxxx. 3; Dan. v. 9; iii. 19.

my whole heart.”—“A wicked man hardeneth his *face*.”—“They have made their *faces* harder than a rock.”—“I will shew them the back and not the *face*.”—“How long wilt thou hide thy *face* from me.”—“The *face* of the Lord is against them that do evil.”—“All *faces* shall gather blackness.”—“Their *faces* shall be as flames.”—“Cause thy *face* to shine and we shall be saved:” with other expressions of a similar nature, amounting indeed to some hundreds. The reason is, says Cruden, because in the *face* our inward motions are made known to others—Love and hatred, desire and dislike, joy and grief, confidence and despair, courage and cowardice, admiration and contempt, pride and humility, cruelty and compassion; and when the thoughts arise from the affections, then the *face* assumes a corresponding expression.—“Then was Nebuchadnezzar full of fury and the form of his *visage* was changed.”—“Then was king Belshazzar greatly troubled, and his *countenance* was changed in him.”—“As many were astonished at thee; his *visage* was so marred more than any man.” In the *face* of Jesus was portrayed his ineffable pity and compassion when the Lord looked upon Peter, and he went out and wept bitterly and the beauty of holiness in the face of Stephen, when his face was seen as it had been the face of an angel.

This language of the face partakes of natural conditions only in so far as the interior forces of Nature are employed by the thoughts in disposing the features. And we need not be told, that the nervous aura which moves the muscles, and modifies the

blood, is not the common atmosphere the vibration of which produces sound, and the articulation of sound, language; but it is an aura silent but more subtle, and more immediately connected with the process of thought, obeying laws altogether different from those of the common atmosphere. In the present day thought moves the lips, thus only one part of the face; and a part is employed often to hide the meaning of the whole. As man came to prefer evil to good, he would naturally love darkness rather than light; and, when pervaded by a sense of either shame or fear, would naturally be disposed to hide his thoughts from man as well as from God. In this case the facial fire and light would gradually die out; and as the language of life disappeared, the necessity would arise for another, artificial, and comparatively dead, suited to his other and more external state; namely, external hieroglyphical symbols and phonetic language.

The human mind, having fallen away from the original knowledge of God and the corresponding interpretation of Nature, would thus have to begin as it were anew from the senses, and to proceed, not as before by the Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters, but by itself under its own guidance, to the development of its own rational powers, hence to new and self-discovered principles of knowledge and religion. Comparatively few traces would remain of the former primeval revelation or heavenly wisdom; and these only so far as that revelation had been handed down by tradition in corrupted forms in history, mythology, and poetry; and so both primitive

languages and religion would exhibit the appearances which they now do.

It will be seen, therefore, that even if we supposed that external and dead signs of thought, viz., both phonetic and written language, had their origin before the Fall, there would have been, in the paradisaical state of mankind, but little use for them. In this case they would have been but little cultivated, and their rudimentary state would be no evidence of the absence of spiritual truth. Their testimony, therefore, cannot affect the question of a primeval revelation, except in so far as a rudimentary language might record traces of former and more enlightened thoughts. We can, therefore, with perfect consistency maintain the doctrine of a primeval revelation, and yet admit, if required, that—

“Theologians\* who claim for language a divine origin, drift into the most dangerous anthropomorphism, when they enter into any details as to the manner in which they suppose the Deity to have compiled a dictionary and grammar in order to teach them to the first man, as a schoolmaster teaches the deaf and dumb. And they do not see that, even if all their premises were granted, they would have explained no more than how the first man might have learnt a language, IF there were a language ready made for him.”

In fine, from what has been said, we are enabled easily to explain the paradox, that “Man† is man only by means of speech, but in order to invent speech he must be already man.”

\* *The Science of Language*. By Professor Max Müller. Third Edition. p. 351.

† *Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man*. By Sir Charles Lyell. p. 468.

*"Let there be light, and there was light."*

First, as to the command.

If the command, "*Let there be light*," means only that God called the light into existence, by what law does it perpetually subsist? If things exist only in virtue of the Word of God, and conservation be perpetual creation, then in order to this perpetual creation, there must be a perpetual utterance of the Divine command. But what is the meaning of a *Divine command*?

"The *commandments*\* of God," says Swedenborg, "or the things which God hath commanded, have all and each relation to *Divine Order*; insomuch that *Divine Order* is nothing but a perpetual commandment of God. Wherefore, also, to live according to the commandments of God and in the commandments of God, is to live according to *Divine Order* and in *Divine Order*. Hence by God's *commanding* is signified that which is according to *Divine Order*."

*Divine command* then is the communication of *Divine thought*; and he to whom it is communicated, if he lives in accordance with it, *i.e.*, in *Divine Order*, acts willingly in obedience to it. God wills in man, and man wills from God, when man obeys the will of God. Moreover God speaks to man, and man hears His voice, when the thoughts of God or His truths are communicated to man, and man thinks from them. Accordingly both Augustin and the *Glossa* observe: "This expression *God said*, does not import any audible voice, but the practical intellect of God; for it includes the divine volition also, be-

\* *Arcana Caelestia*, art. 2634.



cause the effect follows according to the form of the disposition or will."

*"He spake and it was done: he commanded and it stood fast:"* "by which words," says a commentator, "we are to understand not only that all things were created by God, but also that by Him they persist and are governed;" where the persistence of all things is as much attributed to a command as their original existence; in accordance with what the Psalmist says, *"For ever, O Lord, Thy word is established in the heavens: Thy faithfulness is unto all generations: Thou hast established the earth and it abideth: They continue this day according to Thine ordinances."*

It was, then, by a Divine volition that Light came into manifestation, and by a Divine volition that it continues to this day.

But if this be the case, are we to presume that there are no secondary causes?

"Though it be true," says Cudworth,\* "that the works of Nature are dispensed by a Divine law and command, yet this is not to be understood in a vulgar sense, as if they were all effected by the mere force of a *verbal* law or outward command; because inanimate things are not commandable nor governable by such a law. And, therefore, besides the Divine will and pleasure, there must needs be some other immediate agent and executioner provided, for the producing of every effect; since not so much as a stone or other heavy body could at any time fall downward merely by the force of a verbal law, without any other efficient cause; but either God himself must immediately impel it, or else there must

\* *Intellectual System*, i., 317.

be some other subordinate cause in nature for that motion. Wherefore, the Divine law and command, by which the things of Nature are administered, must be conceived to be the real appointment of some energetic, effectual, and operative cause for the production of every effect."

What, then, is the subordinate or secondary cause which operates in the production and continuance of light in the present day? The same with the prototype; Light as it is in heaven. And what is the cause of this light? Surely no other than the Light Archetypal.

God spake and it was light; for the words of God are light because they are the truth. "God is *light*, and in him is no darkness at all." He "layeth the beams of his chambers in the *waters*;" for his chambers are the heavenly mansions which are all his own; the mind of every angel being itself a mansion, a chamber for the Divine Light. In the present case the chambers or receptacles of light are the *waters*—the *scientiæ* or knowledges of the external mind. This is the reason for which the waters which covered the earth are represented as becoming self-luminous, or as transparent; which they do when we see through them, or look from Nature up to Nature's God. Till then they are opaque, or in such a state of internal disarrangement that they do not serve as a medium for the transmission of light, whose rays they pervert, absorb, and suffocate.

Now\* without some arrangement, "the mind is so far from increasing in knowledge by the acquisition

\* Harris's *Philosophical Arrangements*. p. 454.

of new ideas, that while it increases the number these, it does but increase its own perplexity." In like manner if we derange the moral order of the mind; if we place self first and God and our neighbour last, the world first and heaven last; if thus the *mundus sensibilis* be placed over the *mundus intelligibilis*, what is this but Chaotic disorder? which nevertheless, in such a state, the rational faculty does not perceive, because it is in darkness; and is in darkness because it is in disorder. It is this Chaotic state that is referred to by the prophet "Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil that put darkness for light and light for darkness that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter." Now the true order of things must ever depend upon the nature and quality; and such as is our perception of these, such will be their consequent order or disorder in our minds. If those perceptions are perverted the true order of thought will be perverted: and therefore, it is necessary to distinguish well between good and evil, between light and darkness, because in a state of darkness no distinctions can be made. Now this state of darkness and disorder is that of infancy.

The\* embryotic life is but that of a plant; the infant life that of an animal; it is only with the entrance of *light* from above that the distinctly human life commences, and thus that with light from God man first begins to be formed into the image and likeness of God. Indeed, as the ancient philosophy tells us, in our method of teaching we must

\* Nicolas de Lyra, Gen. i. 3.

begin from the most general or elementary principles ; just as children do at first who call all men their fathers and all women their mothers, but afterwards learn to make a distinction between them. This distinction cannot be made except by the manifestation of the light ; " all things are made manifest by the light," and, therefore, *distinction* can commence only with the *light*.

"Hence," observes the *Glossa*, "*God said let there be light*, namely, the light of natural reason, which is a certain impression made by the Divine light in us."—In the present case it was the light of the Word within man, as received by the rational faculty. For if God alone be Light, then from Him alone can all true light proceed ; not from any angel speaking in man or to man, although it may be through an angel or angelic host to man, as was commonly the case in the Old Testament ; and as is generally admitted to have been the case in the Adamic dispensation. When, therefore, it is said, "*And God said let there be light*," it was a communication to man, that as he was now prepared by the Spirit and desired the Light, so also he should be enlightened, and man should acknowledge that he had now received light from God, from whom alone it could proceed. And as it is light that enables the bodily eye to see, so it is light that enables the rational faculty to see. In darkness all objects are blended into one : it is light alone that enables us to discriminate, to distinguish one object from another, and to see them in their proper places. In virtue of this light, the mind is enabled to make discriminations, and arrange its

thoughts in such a succession as to reason correctly.

"The\* Scripture affirms Light to be superior, absolutely separate from and antecedent to darkness. When God said, 'Let there be light, and there was light,' no change happened to Eternal Light itself, nor did any light then begin to be. But the darkness of this world began to receive a power, or operation of the Eternal Light upon it which it had not before; or Eternity then began to open some resemblance to its own glory, in the dark elements and shadows of time.

"The Scripture says, that '*God dwelleth in the light which no man can approach*;' therefore the Scripture teaches that Light in itself is and must be invisible to man; that it cannot be approached or made manifest to him but in and by something that is not light, and that which is not light is darkness.

"Light, as it is in itself, is only in the supernatural Deity; and this is the reason why no man nor any created being can approach to it, or have any sensibility of it as it is in itself. And yet no light can come into this world but that in which God dwelt before any world was created. No light can be in time but that which was the light of Eternity. If, therefore, the supernatural light is to manifest something of its incomprehensible glory, and make itself in some degree sensible and visible to the creature, this supernatural light must enter into Nature, it must put on materiality.

"The incomprehensible Deity can make no outward Revelation of His Will, Wisdom, and Goodness, but by articulate sounds, voices, or letters written on tables of stone, or such like materiality. Just so the invisible, inaccessible, supernatural Light can make no outward visibility of itself, but through such darkness of materiality as is capable of

\* Works of Edmund Law, vol. viii. *Spirit of Love*: part ii., p. 184, 186, 189.

receiving its illumination.—All light that is natural and visible to the creature, whether in heaven or on earth, is nothing else but so much darkness illuminated: and that which is called the materiality of light, is only the materiality of darkness, in which the light incorporates itself."

In reference to the human mind, the dark ground is the *lumen* of the natural man before he has received light (*lux*) from the Spirit of God; and this *lumen* is received from what some have called material ideas, as involving conditions proper to matter, such as those of Space and Time.

That a dark ground is requisite for the exhibition of light, and that light is thus illuminated darkness, is both a scientific fact and a moral truth.

Even\* Democritus acknowledged that "There are two species of knowledge, the one genuine the other dark and obscure. The dark and obscure knowledge is seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching. But the genuine knowledge is another more hidden and recondite."

"Philosophy or true wisdom," says Plato, "is the return of the mind from out of that dark life, which is rather to be called *night* than life, to the true *light* of being. Wherefore he everywhere exhorts those who are seeking after wisdom, that, trampling under foot the concupiscences of the flesh, they might be at leisure to enquire into and contemplate truth alone, and the Divine *light*. For God is being itself, beauty itself, life itself."

Here, then, the true distinction is made between night and day: God called the light day, and the darkness called he night.

\* Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, iii., 214.

"The naming," says Augustin, "was not effected by any language; because with God there is pure intellect without any utterance of the tongue. But He called, *i.e.*, *caused* to be called, because He Himself had made the distinction; so that the two could be discerned one from the other, and receive their separate names or designations."

The dark *waters* then, on which descended light from above, were the sensuous knowledges of the natural man; for these, as we have seen, were the waters of the deep or abyse; for in that state of darkness heaven and heavenly things are to him the *Chaos*: the life hereafter is "a land of darkness and of the shadow of death." A land of darkness as darkness itself, and of the shadow of death, without any *order*, and where the light is as darkness.

When, therefore, God said "*Let there be light*," it implied that the external mind had been brought by the Spirit of God into that state in which it could perceive spiritual truth from God, or genuine light; and not mistake light for darkness or darkness for light. This preparation had already been effected by the Spirit of God, which had been moving upon the face of the waters, infusing into them the heat and warmth of new affections and desires, thus disposing them to the reception of corresponding light from above; for otherwise the light might have shone in darkness, and the darkness have comprehended it not.

The sum is this: Divine thought is communicated to the angelic hosts, that the light of wisdom which illuminates their heavens should now descend, according to its gradations, and illuminate the dark waters.

of the earthly mind. The secondary causes are, therefore, the angelic heavens which are brought into nearer communication with man. Light upon the dark waters upon earth, being but light from the bright waters in heaven. For *waters* in heaven have the same signification as upon earth, namely, that of *scientiæ* or knowledges of spiritual truths; and these spiritual truths illuminating the faces and the forms of angels, are represented as apparently an aqueous element, sometimes "mingled with *fire*," namely, the fire of Divine Love. "Before the throne there was a sea of glass like unto crystal." Hence the language of the Psalmist: "The waters saw thee, oh God! the waters saw thee! they were afraid: the depths also were troubled:" for such to the angels appear the changes of human thought, when "the people that walked in darkness have beheld a great light, and they that dwelt in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined."

"*And God called the light day; and the darkness called he night.*" "For," says the *Glossa*, "*Knowledge is light and ignorance is darkness.*"—"When\* sophists assail us, says Mr. Harris, and either exhibit one thing for another, or two things for one and the same; to what surer weapon can we recur for defence, than to that of precise and well established *distinction*?"—In this state of the mind there is no ground for doubt, or opinion; no controversy as to whether a thing be, or be not, in accordance with the Word of God: there is the absolute conviction in the mind which arises from

\* *Philosophical Arrangements*, p. 378.



a perception of the light as light—there was light, for God was the cause of it : “ *God said* ”—“ *God saw* ”—“ *God divided* ”—“ *God called* ”—all was the word of God and the work of God. It was only afterwards when the doubt began to arise, “ *Yea hath God said,* ” that the foundations of doubt were laid for all future ages, hence also of unbelief. True distinctions began to be unperceived, *Chaos* came back again, and the authority and wisdom of man came to be substituted for those of God. Thus—“ Democritus\* held that there was nothing absolutely true ; but because he thought knowledge or understanding to be *sense*, therefore did he conclude that whatsoever seemed according to *sense*, must of necessity be true (not absolutely but relatively) to whom it so seemed.” All rational knowledge he resolved into *opinion*.

“ If a Christian,” says Locke,† “ who has the view of happiness and misery in another life be asked why a man must keep his word, he will give this as a reason ; because God, who has the power of eternal life and death, requires it of us.”—He has a perception that it is a moral duty commanded by God ; and this conviction of a divine origin is the ground of all moral law in the mind, all moral duty, and hence all moral responsibility. Let the duty be ascribed to any other origin, and certainty and assurance cease. Thus, some philosophers say, that man ought to be faithful to his covenant, not because God has said so, but because the public require it ; some, because it is below the dignity of a man to act otherwise ;

\* Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, iv., 120.

† *Essay on the Human Understanding*, i., 36.

others, as Paley who repudiates the doctrine of a moral sense, would refer it to custom and public opinion. In all cases of this kind, it is not God that speaks, but man: the origin of the moral sense is no longer ascribed to God but to man. The light which once distinguished good from evil, right from wrong, has become obscure; and moral and spiritual truths become a matter of debate and human *opinion*, instead of being regarded with the certainty implied in the words—"God said."

6. "*And God said, Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.*" In the midst of the waters—"that is," says the *Glossa*, "in the midst of *knowledges*, some of which are *under* the firmament, as being deduced from first principles; others *above*, as being given by revelation from God."—"The Sacred Scripture," says Augustin, "may be called the *firmament*; as may also the doctrine and discipline which divide the spiritual waters from the carnal."—In these cases, the term *firmament* is taken to express the first principles of knowledge which are *firmly* established. It is now however well known, that the original signifies an *expanse*. In this case the *expanse* is a region of the mind; as when we speak of an *expansion* of the mind, *expanded* thoughts and ideas, an enlarged mind in opposition to a narrow, contracted, and limited mind. A narrow mind is a mind possessing few ideas: an *expanded* mind one possessing many, or enlarged ideas. In this case *expansion* is the same with development; faculties, like flowers, when developed are expanded. Locke

observes, that it\* "is near as hard to conceive existence, or to have an idea of any real being a perfect negation of all manner of *expansion*, is to have the idea of any real existence with a negation of all manner of duration." But the extension of mind and the expansion of matter are different from each other as mind is from matter. When it is said that the kingdom of heaven is near to us, it does not mean the expansion of the sphere of heaven, but of the angelic; where distance is measured by state and is according to state, as when we speak of persons who are distant from each other in their minds, while yet they may be near in relation to their bodies. The creation then of an extension between the waters is the perception of a distance hence also of a difference, between the waters above and the waters *below*, that is, between spiritual knowledge derived from *within*, and natural knowledge derived from *without*; thus a distinction is perceived between the natural man and the spiritual man, the external man and the internal man, and this in consequence of a region of intervening ideas, or spiritual truths.

For, as Swedenborg observes, "Man,† he is regenerated, does not even know that an internal man exists, much less does he know the nature and quality thereof. In consequence of his immersion in corporeal and worldly things, he cannot perceive there is any distinction between the internal and external man; and the things in the in-

\* *Essay on the Human Understanding*, i. 187.

† *Arcana Celestia*, art. 24.

man being lost in the same immersion, he forms *one obscure confused mass* out of two substances that are totally *distinct*." Thus, as an ancient writer observes, "There are those who do not make a good *division* between the *waters*; they cherish vice within under a semblance of virtue."

This view of the subject answers to that description of Chaos which we have already given. For if a state of nature be represented as "*ratio mersa et confusa*," in which reason and the senses lie commingled with each other, and there is no due distinction between sensuous appearances and rational truths, between physical and moral, God and nature, but all things are confounded with all: the only way of leading the mind out of this state is by enabling it to make *distinctions*; and as objects become more distinguished, so the mind becomes more spacious and *expanded*; and thus also the field of its contemplation. The telescope, by enabling the eye to behold new regions of worlds, and to encrease its powers of distinction, expanded the heavens and expanded the mind at the same time; by creating an expanse between the earth and the stars, thus being as it were a creator of space; and by being a creator of new ideas, thus of new heights and depths of human thought.

When the mind is thus *expanded*, the distinction is more clearly perceived between *above* and *below*, between *heaven* and *earth*. The *truths* which descend into the higher or heavenly region of the mind, are the *waters* which are above the heavens; and those which pertain to the external memory, are the *waters* which are *below*. To commingle these waters is to

return to the Chaotic state, to confound heaven and earth.

"The\* knowledge of man," says Lord Bacon, "is *waters*, some descending from *above*, and some springing *beneath*; the one informed by the light of *nature*, the other inspired by Divine *revelation*. The light of nature comes in the notions of the mind and the reports of the senses, as for knowledge which man receiveth by teaching, is cumulative and not original; as in a water that, besides its own spring head, is fed with other springs and streams. Then, according to these two differing illuminations or origins, knowledge is first of all divided into Divinity and Philosophy.

If this distinction holds good, surely they can rightly divide between the waters, who confound natural science with spiritual truth; or who make no distinction between the literal and the spiritual sense of the Word of God. Yet how common is this want of distinction in the present day! there are no lights seen above the expanse, nor indeed any expansion all above that of merely natural thought. They lie flat in the deep below; and any light in virtue of any distinction may be made between the visible and the invisible is regarded not as light from God but as an *artificial*. The Spirit of God indeed is acknowledged to move upon the face of the waters, and this is Inspiration; but the process does not continue onwards to the production of light, much less to the distinction between the waters; and so darkness lies upon the face of the Scripture. "We† may

\* *De Augmentis Scientiarum*—The Proficiency and Advancement of Learning Divine and Human, p. 124. Montagu's Ed. Vol. i.

† *The Sacred Record of Creation Vindicated and Explained*, p. 74.

clude," says Archdeacon Huxtable, "that the first section of the Bible, as well as its concluding portion, is a *parable*, and that the purpose of the *Parable*, in the one case as well as in the other, is, in conformity with the whole scope of Revelation, to convey to us information not relating to physical facts, but simply to religious."

Here then is an attempt to distinguish between the waters, between *natural* truth and *religious* truth; between *external* truth and *internal* truth; but the advocates of *Chaos* are many, and seem to be more in number than the gods which were said to be born of Chaos and Night.

It is remarkable, however, that some of the heathens both acknowledged and yet confounded the distinction: for even Julian taught, that—

"We\* ought not to view and contemplate the heaven and the world, with the same eyes that oxen and horses do, but so as from that which is visible to their outward senses, to discern and discover another invisible nature under it."—"That is," says Cudworth, "they professed to behold all things with religious eyes, and to see God in everything, not only as pervading all things, and diffused through all things, but also as being in a manner all things."

Thus did these heathens acknowledge and at the same time confound the distinction between God and Nature, heaven and earth. In the spiritual sense, therefore, of the sixth and seventh verses, these fundamental distinctions of the human mind, namely, between *natural* and *spiritual*, are practically treated of, and the origin shewn of all Pantheism and Atheism.

\* Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, ii. 522.

For even some Christian writers have not observed this distinction; but have regarded the world as "*Deum explicatum*,"\* God expanded or unfolded—and when they call the creatures, as St. Jerome and others often do, *radios Deitatis*, the rays of Deity."

Now the waters which are *above* the heavens are those which proceed from the throne of God, as described in the Apocalypse; and they are waters of life, or living waters, which descend from above into the minds of the angels; and therefore when it is said, "*Praise him ye heaven of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens*," it is said by an ancient writer, that the *waters* which are *above*, are those which flow from divine and celestial motives, and which purify the soul: in which case the appeal in the Psalm is made to Divine Truth, to descend and enable the mind to worship the Lord in spirit and in truth. In† profane writings, says Swedenborg, the appeal to the stars, the sun and moon, water and whales, fire and hail, mountains, trees, beasts and cattle, would be regarded as merely hyperbolic; "but in the Word of the Lord nothing is hyperbolic but everything is significative and representative." Accordingly Dean Trench‡ also observes, that the *entire* moral and visible world is from beginning end a mighty *parable*, a great teaching of supernatural truth, a help at once to our faith and to our understanding. Here again is a recognition of principle which distinguishes between the *waters*.

And who is it that first distinguished betw

\* *Ibid.*, ii., 100.

† *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 776.

‡ *Notes on the Parables*, p. 16.

them?—The WORD OF GOD who created them; that very WORD which said, "*Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst.*" When therefore the Word of God distinguished between the waters, did he omit from the "Divine Idea" the spiritual waters, and think only of the natural, of which whosoever drinketh shall thirst again? Did he mean to tell us in the first Chapter of Genesis, that the natural waters were first to be sought; and in the fourth chapter of John, not the natural but the spiritual? Or, if we admit that when He distinguished between the waters, He retained in His own Divine mind the idea of *spiritual waters*, did He so create and distinguish between the waters as to overlook the distinction between the spiritual and the natural, and thus exclude the *spiritual* altogether? If not, why shall *we* exclude it, under the pretext, that if we do not, we are substituting a *mystical* Creation for a *physical*, and indulging in mere imaginations? If, on the other hand, He did combine the two in His own Divine mind, why may we not do the same, when reading the Word written?

7. "*And it was so :*" the distinction was made by God himself, however that distinction might be afterwards confounded or obliterated. There was at first no more doubt of the work itself than of the Word. "*And God said—and it was so :*" it was the responsive *Amen* of the perceptive faculty, the moral certainty that the mind of man was then empowered by Divine Truth to make the distinction, that rendered man responsible for ever after for the use of that faculty; for which he could be justly called before a Divine



tribunal, and on which depended his everlasting condition.

8. "*And God called the expanse Heaven.*" It is said of God, that "He calleth all the stars by their names," and this is generally admitted to signify that He knew their respective natures and qualities. What then is the quality signified by *Heaven*? The visible heaven is the sphere of the active forces of Nature. These forces are the disposers or the ordinator of all that is below, which is relatively passive; and therefore *heaven* implies what is active and interior, in relation to what is passive and exterior. In this point of view, therefore, *heaven* in the human mind is the region of the activities of interior thought and will; which in Scripture is always called "the kingdom of God within us," or "the kingdom of heaven;" because heaven or the spiritual mind rules the earth or the natural. And so important is this distinction between heavenly and earthly, that to confound it is the greatest possible of sins, viz., *profanation*—the very term *holy* signifying that which is set apart. *Heaven* therefore signifies the *mundus intelligibilis* in man as distinguished from the *mundus sensibilis*; and by God calling this region of the mind *heaven*, is signified the perception within the mind of a higher region *distinct* from the lower: and hence the necessity of assigning to it a distinct name, signifying that it is *interior*, spiritual, heavenly, and that to it are all rule and government committed. God calls the expanse *heaven* to signify that it was supreme, hence His own dwelling place in the human mind, from which he would dispose into order the natural mind

below. The expression therefore has an especial relation to the first principles of *Divine Order*.

This view of the subject is confirmed by Kirby in his *Bridgewater Treatise* ;\*—

"What are the *Heavens*? This is a query which at first every one thinks he can answer; but yet when the term comes to be sifted, it will be found that few have any definite idea of its real meaning. Generally speaking, the expanse over our heads, and the bodies it contains, are understood by the word *Heavens*; but when analyzed, it will be found to indicate chiefly powers in *action* contained in that expanse, and which act upon these bodies; powers that in the various systems of the Universe have various centres dispersed throughout space, each having a local or partial action upon its own system, and all derived originally, and still maintained, from and by one parent fountain, the centre of all irradiation, of all light, of all life and energy."

"*Heaven* or *the heavens*—in the Hebrew language is derived from a root, which signifies to *dispose*, or *place* with *skill*, *care*, and *order*, as say the lexicographers; so that literally the common plural term would be *the disposers* or *placers*."

Hence the deities of the Greeks were called *θεοί*, *disposers* or *placers*, *i.e.*, of all things in the world, and to them were assigned their distribution and ordination.† The term therefore has an especial reference to the previous state of Chaos; God having established in the human mind an *expanse* or region

\* *Introduction*, p. 77, 78.

† This derivation of the term harmonizes with the fact: but another has been given, *viz.*, from *θέω* to *run*—in reference to the courses of the stars, which also were supposed, in their circuits, to govern all things. Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, ii. 400.

of thoughts and affections, which were thence to flow down into the mental Chaos or natural mind, and thus reduce it to order. To call the expanse *heaven* is, therefore, to endue that region of the mind with that nature and quality which *heaven* signifies. This distinction began to be lost sight of at the Fall; and the consequence has been Naturalism and Pantheism. The deities, who have been the disposers and placers, have been *the senses*; or else the *sciences* as founded upon observation and experiment. In these, and by these, have been built up the human mind, that is to say, its inverted self-hood. "The\* knowledge of truth, you will find," says Lucretius, "is derived from the *senses* as its origin, and you will own that the *senses* cannot be refuted. . . . That therefore which at any time whatsoever seemed to be true to *them*, is true."

Now the faculty of discerning truth from falsehood, good from evil, is the distinguishing faculty of the human mind; and the question of Pilate—"What is truth" shewed at once that this faculty was lost or that the region of the mind, originally called *heaven*, had been closed. Hence, when our Lord said "Hereafter shall ye see *heaven opened*," it implied that he had come to open that region of the mind which pertained the faculty of perceiving truth, thus create the *expanse* anew. Therefore He said so of "the kingdom of *heaven*—of the new expanse—in hand"—that inward region in which truth perceived, into which it was received, and from which sovereignty over the natural mind was to be exerted. It was in this way that Stephen saw *heaven open*

\* Lucretius, book iv., 479.

and the truth in its reality—“Jesus—standing at the right hand of God ;” because first of all the heavens had been opened within Jesus Himself, when He saw the spirit of God (*i.e.*, of Truth) descending upon Him like a dove. And He it was who opened the kingdom of heaven, thus of truth, to all believers. To a large portion of mankind this expanse, or kingdom of heaven, has been closed, and has become a lost region of the human mind. The question is still asked—“What is truth?”

9. “*And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear.*” The process of *distinction* is still carried on. “All knowledges,” says the *Glossa*, “are within the understanding; and thus the *flesh*” (or the sensuous sphere of the mind, the *mundus sensibilis*) “is seen to be without them; but as in this case it is ruled from heaven, *i.e.*, the spirit, it makes proficiency in good works, wherefore it is added, ‘*let the earth bring forth,*’” *etc.* The interpretation given by Swedenborg teaches that all rational knowledges constitute a distinct and superior sphere of the mind, in which they have their place, order, and arrangement; and as such that the animal or corporeal man is seen to be in an inferior place or region. The two regions ultimately receive distinct names, because they are distinct things; the distinction being made by the Creator Himself, and thus implying a Divine order of things introduced into the original constitution of the human mind. Thus, for instance, we have the internal man called *heaven*, as distinguished from the external man; and now at length

the external man is distinguished into *seas* and *earth*, or knowledge and will; the will here spoken of being that by which external actions are performed. If we consider, says a writer,\*—

“The order of things in the frame of the world, we find the body of the earth situated first and lowest in order, over which the water is spread as being lighter and more moveable; next above the water is the air or atmosphere; and above that a purer region, to which they (*viz.*, the ancients) gave the name of fire.

In respect to their weight, says he, they naturally dispose themselves into this order; earth takes its place below water, water below air, air below the more subtle and active elements of the heavens. Now the order observable in the outward universe, is not more accurate than that observable in the inward. The regions of the mind are arranged one above the other with the utmost exactitude; and all this that external things might not rule over internal—the natural mind over the spiritual; for in this inversion of order, as we shall afterwards perceive, consisted the Fall.

“*Let the dry land appear:*” “My soul thirsteth for thee,” says the Psalmist, “my flesh longeth for thee in a barren and *dry land*, where no water is,” *i.e.*, no waters of life, or living waters, no truths of the Word of God. The *dry* or *dry land*, is that which receives the waters; and here represents the heart or affections thirsting after divine truth, thus it represents a soil in the effort to bring forth herbage—*i.e.*, a soil which is good ground. In the present

\* Works of the Rev. W. Jones, Nayland. Vol. ix. p. 174.

case, the *dry land* is distinguished from the *waters*: the person is conscious of the distinction between the desire of knowledge for its own sake, and the desire of knowledge with a view to bring forth first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. Hence God called the dry land *earth*; and it is immediately afterwards added, "And God said, Let the *earth* bring forth, the *herb* yielding seed, and the *fruit tree* yielding fruit after his kind."

*Earth* possessing these qualities is interpreted by our Lord as signifying an honest and good heart, fitted to receive and nourish the seed of the Word; hence also its denomination as *matter* from *mater*, as denoting its uses in receiving, nourishing, and bringing forth; hence also the term *Nature*, as signifying the *offspring* of matter, or germinations from the earth: in the present case the earth yielding seed.

10. *And God called the dry land Earth, and the gathering together of the waters called He Seas.*" The general name of *Seas* is here given to all kinds of external *scientiæ*, called by our older writers *knowledge*s. In the prophecy of Jacob concerning Joseph it is said,\* The God of thy fathers "shall bless thee with blessings of heaven above, blessings of the *deep that lieth under*," etc., signifying truth in the superior region of the mind, or heavenly truth; and truth in the inferior region of the mind, or external knowledges. So again, "He hath founded it upon the *seas*, and established it upon the *floods*." The *floods* here spoken of are rivers which flow from their

\* *Genesis* xlix. 25; so also *Deuteronomy* xxxiii. 13. This interpretation is taken from the *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 6431.

springs down into the sea, the sea being in this case the boundary of the rivers on the one side as the springs are on the other. It is in the sense of the *seas* being thus the ultimate limit or boundary of the waters, where they are gathered together, that the name of *seas* is here given; *earth* having relation to the affections, and *seas* to external knowledge; for literally speaking, neither the earth nor the world are established or founded upon water. Similar distinctions are implied in the Apocalypse,—“Worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the *sea*, and the *fountains of waters*.”—“And the third angel poured out his vial upon the *rivers* and *fountains of waters*.”—“And the third angel sounded, and there fell a great star from heaven, burning as it were a lamp, and it fell upon the third part of the *rivers*, and upon the *fountains of waters*.” And further, we are told of one beast arising out of the *earth*, and another out of the *sea*. The interpretations we have given of these terms are essentially the same with those which have been given by a whole *catena* of interpreters of the Apocalypse, from the earliest ages of the Christian Church.

*Earth*, taken in a good sense, as receiving the seed of the Word, and thus bringing forth fruit to perfection, signifies for this reason the Church.

In this favorable sense we find the symbol made use of in the Apocalypse:\* “I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the *earth*, holding the four winds of the *earth*, that the wind should not blow on the *earth*, nor on the *sea*, nor on any *tree* ;” in which

\* Chap. vii. 1.

case is signified, that no injury was to be permitted to the honest and good heart, to the external or inferior truths of which it was in possession, nor yet to truths of a higher order signified by *trees*; for *trees*, in the scale of vegetable life, are of a higher order than the *herb* or the *grass*.

So again:\* "The first angel sounded and there followed hail and fire mingled with blood, and they were cast upon the *earth*; and the third part of *trees* was burnt up, and all *green grass* was burnt up." By *green grass* is signified the incipient or rudimentary truths of the Word of God, which had been received in stony places, and when the sun was risen, having no root they were scorched and withered up: and by the *trees* are meant truths of a higher order, which were scorched and withered up for the same reason. The burning up of *grass* and *trees*, says a commentator, is to express the decay of spiritual life and moisture in all true Christianity, and that not only in weak ones as *grass*, but in the strong as *trees*.

Again: "It was commanded them that they should not hurt the *grass* of the *earth*, neither any *green thing*, nor any *tree*;" where *grass* signifies the external truths of faith which first spring up in man; any *green thing*, whatsoever has any spiritual life; and *tree*, the perceptions of truth which lead to the fruits of a good life.

So again in Isaiah:† "The *grass* faileth, there is no *green thing*;" and again in Zechariah,‡ "The Lord shall make bright clouds, and give them showers

\* Chap. viii. 7; ix. 4.

† Chap. xv. 6.

‡ Chap. x. 1.



the *good ground* in which the Creator sows of virtue.

*Correspondences* have indeed been popular metaphors or figures of speech; whereas figures of things. We have already observed in natural science the relation of the vegetable to the animal, and of the animal kingdom to the human; but the relation of the human to the animal is not metaphorical, but founded upon relations of structure and function: were otherwise, there could be no such sciences as Comparative Anatomy and Comparative Physiology on the ground of these organic correspondences that there has been established, what has been nominated, a unity between the plant, the animal, and man.

It is on this ground that, in the Mosaique like religious rite was predicated with respect to *trees* as with respect to *men*. "When† ye come into the land, and shall have planted all sorts of *trees* for food, then ye shall count the *fruit* of *trees* as *uncircumcised*: three years shall it be *uncircumcised* to you; it shall not be eaten of. the fourth year all the *fruit* thereof shall be to praise the Lord withal." It is obvious in this that pruning was to the tree what circumcision

\* *Rewards and Punishments*, art. 2.

† Leviticus

to man, and that, consequently, pruning, regarded as circumcision, had a signification beyond the external act: namely, that as the land was to be regarded as profaned by the former idolatries, so was the fruit of the tree, as being the produce of the land, to be regarded as unholy; that as the land was now to be dedicated to Jehovah, so was also the fruit of the tree—a dedication represented by the pruning or circumcision of the trees. In this case the *tree* was regarded, at first, as being such only as the unhallowed earth could bring forth; and such as was the earth, such, in this case, was the vegetation.

Now, in the first chapter of Genesis, the earth was not yet in the paradisiacal state; therefore neither was the vegetation: hence, as we shall see in its proper place, it is altogether different from that which is mentioned in the second chapter. The two narratives therefore do not clash, because they relate to different things, *i.e.*, to two different states of the human mind; the *earth* having a relation to the first efforts of the will toward good from those new motives which arise after the mind has been led to distinguish heavenly things from earthly, and to suffer itself to be ruled by influences from heaven. The state therefore of the will, as here described, is parallel to that of which our Saviour speaks when He says, "If any man will do the will of my Father which is in heaven, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God."

We are now describing actual stages of progression in the regenerate life: and have seen that the state before the commencement of this life was what is

commonly called the state of Nature, and is represented by *Chaos*, in which no distinction is perceived between things natural and spiritual: this is a state of darkness. The *first* step out of this state is illustration by the Spirit of God, or an entrance of light from above into the external knowledges (*scientiæ*) of the mind: hence a progression from evening to morning, from ignorance to knowledge. The *second* step is, consequently, a perception of the distinction between things natural and things spiritual. The *third* step is another distinction, but in the natural mind only, namely, between *water* (*scientiæ*) and *earth*; or between knowledge and the first efforts of the will to bring forth the lowest forms of life. We now proceed to the fourth step.

14. "*And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years.*"

15. "*And let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth: and it was so.*"

"Well is it said that first of all," says the *Glossa*, "the earth brought forth grass and herb, and that the luminaries were made afterwards; because after good works are wrought then comes *illumination*, by which is signified the appearance of *truth from above*. On the fourth day on which, in the firmament above mentioned, the mind originates spiritual perceptions, and distinguishes between them, it sees what is unchangeable Truth, which shines as a *Sun in the soul*; and how the soul is made partaker of it, and communicates order and beauty to the body as the moon illuminates the night.

In which firmament also all the stars, *i.e.*, all *spiritual perceptions*, shine in the darkness of this life, as in the night."

In the Wisdom\* of Solomon those who had persecuted the righteous man are represented as saying, "Therefore have we erred from the way of truth, and the *light of righteousness* hath not shined unto us, and the *Sun of righteousness* rose not upon us." And in Malachi—"Unto† you that fear my name, shall the *Sun of righteousness* arise with healing in his wings."

When God said, "Let there be light," the waters became the medium of the light, and thus appeared to be self-luminous, or as if the light proceeded from them. So we speak of the light of natural reason, as if natural reason were self-luminous; and though we may say that it is not so, but that it proceeds from the Spirit of God giving light to the *scientiæ* acquired by natural reason, yet there is at first no perception that this is the case, because no perception of higher truths, hence of that *expanse* or higher region of the mind where spiritual truth is perceived as distinct from merely natural.

This *expanse* is created by the acquisition of spiritual or heavenly truths: and, consequently, being of an order superior to that of the natural mind, the apparent source of light is transferred from one region of the mind to another, thus, from earth to heaven; for as, at first, it was the waters (*scientiæ*) of the earth or natural mind that gave light, so now it is the expanse above the earth, in which are fixed and settled principles of truth and love, from which light

\* Chap. v. 6.

† Malachi iv. 2.

and heat flow down to the natural mind. And not only so, but the mind is brought into the perception that it is so.

We thus see the force of the expression, "Let there be lights in *the expanse*;" i.e., not in the waters or *scientiæ* below the expanse, but in the region above the natural mind, in which are contained those truths which are to operate as the living, active forces, disposing, ordering, and energizing all that is in the passive region of the natural faculties below. When these sources of light are closed to the mind, its state is thus described: "I beheld\* the heavens, and they had no *light*."—"When† I shall put thee out I will cover the heaven, and make the *stars* thereof dark: I will cover the *sun* with a cloud, and the *moon* shall not give her light. All the *bright lights* of heaven will I make dark over thee; and set darkness upon thy land, saith the Lord God."—"It shall‡ be dark to you that ye shall not divine; and the *sun* shall go down over the prophets, and the *day* shall be dark over them."

These are not poetical expressions, as commonly supposed, but *signs* made use of to describe the moral and spiritual state of the mind. God did not say, Let them be for metaphors, but for *signs*. And in like manner as when the bright lights of heaven are put out, the *expanse* of heaven disappears; so when the light of spiritual truth is put out, men deny the existence in the human mind of the *expanse*, thus of any capacity for knowing the things of heaven. Hence the denial of the Science of Corre-

\* Jeremiah iv. 23.

† Ezekiel xxxii. 7.

‡ Micah iii. 6.

spondence; for there can be no correspondence between the things of heaven and the things of earth, if no expanse of heaven has yet been created; because the correspondence cannot be perceived before it exists. The state of illumination, however, here referred to, is not that of the vision of God; for the Christian, in the present case, does not behold the Sun, but the objects upon earth illuminated by the Sun, that is, truths in the natural mind illuminated by Spiritual truths from above. It is light from the objects that he beholds, not the light as distinguished from the objects seen in the light; for it is expressly said, that the end in view was "to give light upon earth," i.e., to the region of the natural mind. It was by the state of these lights that the whole state of the human mind was to be judged; and therefore it is that they were to serve as *signs* of all the various phases of the Church. Such as was the state of these luminaries, such was the state of the Church. If this *Sun* were darkened, the Church was darkened; if the *Moon* were turned into blood, the truth of the Church was corrupted; if the *Stars* fell from heaven, the Church had lost possession of the spiritual knowledges which God had once set up in her expanse. If, therefore, we would judge of the state of mankind, thus of the Church, we must judge of her by the state of these lights. And, indeed, this we see acknowledged in the *Homilies* of the Church of England, where it is said,—

"But\* indeed God would signify by the *darkness* of the *Sun*, into what darkness and blindness of ignorance and

\* *Second Part of the Sermon against Peril of Idolatry.*

idolatry, Christendom should fall by the occasion of images. The bright *Sun* of His eternal Truth, and *light* of His holy Word, by the mists and black clouds of men's traditions being blemished and darkened," etc., etc.

It is in the same sense that Isaiah says, "The *Stars* of heaven\* and the *constellations* thereof shall not give their light, the *Sun* shall be darkened in his going forth and the *Moon* shall not cause her light to shine;" for Wisdom itself, as the brightness of the everlasting light, is that *Sun* whose beams are intercepted in their going forth; the *Moon*, the truths of faith and charity received from that *Sun*; and the *Stars*, the spiritual knowledges of the Word of God; so that if in a dark state of the Church a person should say—"Love and wisdom no longer animate and enlighten the Church; faith and charity have departed; there is no knowledge of the truths salvation:" supposing such an one to be caught up into heaven like St. John, he would see the same truths in representative forms; *Stars* with their light being extinguished; and a *Sun* and *Moon* undergoing eclipse. Hence we read that—"The† fourth angel sounded, and the third part of the *Sun* was smitten, and the third part of the *Moon*, and the third part of the *Stars*, so as the third part of them was darkened, and the *day* shone not for the third part of it, and the *night* likewise." In this case the Sun, Moon, and Stars were fulfilling their office as *signs*.

So again in Zechariah:‡ "And it shall come to pass in that day that the *light* shall not be clear nor

\* Isaiah xiii. 10.

† Apocalypse viii. 12.

‡ Chap. xiv. 6.

dark ; but it shall be one day which shall be known to the Lord : not day nor night ; but it shall come to pass that at evening time it shall be light."

"In that day, *under the Christian dispensation*," says Scott, "for a long season the *light* would be neither clear nor dark : it would be greatly obscured by ignorance, heresy, superstition, and idolatry ; yet not wholly extinguished ; and the state of the Church would be much deformed by sin and calamities ; yet some holiness and consolation would be found. This period could neither be called a clear bright day, cheered and illumined by the shining of a summer's sun, nor would it be dark as if the *Sun* were set or totally eclipsed ; but it would contain a great mixture of truth and error, of holiness and sin, of happiness and misery. Yet it would form one day, and never be interrupted by a night of total darkness. It would also be known unto the Lord as to the degree of its light and the term of its continuance ; and he would watch over it and take care of his cause and people during all the time of it. But his people would hardly know whether to call it *day* or *night*, or a compound of both ; yet at length, toward the evening of the world, the *Sun of Righteousness* would break forth and shine with unclouded splendor, dispelling the gloom of ignorance, heresy, idolatry, and superstition ; and illuminating the Church and the earth with knowledge, righteousness, peace and consolation."

Accordingly a writer in his *Memoirs of a Deist*,\* when shewing how he passed from Deism to Christianity, observes—"Thus the *light of the Word of God*, and particularly of the New Testament, became to me as the *Sun* of my soul ; and human nature became as the *earth* which it enlivens and enlightens." The reason of this language was, that God was then

\* Part i., 179.



performing in his mind the work of the Fourth day. He had created the expanse above, and distinguished between the waters and the dry land below. The tender herb had begun to spring up; and then came the manifestation of the truth from above, as fixed and undoubted as the *Sun* in the firmament.

We are now enabled to see whence Plato and Philo borrowed their ideas concerning the Sun, Moon, and Stars; for Plato illustrated his doctrine of the Supreme Good by a resemblance to the Sun: as to the Supreme Good, says he,—

“This\* is the same in the intelligible world to intellect (or knowledge) and intelligibles, that the *Sun* is in the sensible world to sight and visibles. For as the *Sun* is not sight but only the cause of it; nor is that light by which we see, the same with the *Sun* itself, but only *ἡλιοειδές* a *Sun-like thing*; so neither is the Supreme and Highest Good properly knowledge, but the cause of knowledge; nor is intellect, precisely considered as such, the best and most perfect being, but only *ἀγαθοειδές*, a boniform thing. Again, as the *Sun* gives to things not only their visibility, but also their generation; so does that Highest Good not only cause the cognoscibility of things, but also their very essences and beings.—This Highest Good being not in itself properly essence, but above essence, transcending the same, both in respect of dignity and power.”

But whence did Plato derive this doctrine? According to Celsus it should seem, that “the† doctrine of eternal ideas, as the paradigms and patterns of all things here below in this sensible world, was not proper to Plato nor the Greeks, but common with

\* *Intellectual System*, ii., 302.

† *Ibid.*, p. 547.

them to the *Egyptians* also.” Nay, even Julian, borrowing from Plato, says—“that\* visible *Sun* which we see with our eyes, is but an image of another intelligible and invisible one ; so likewise the visible *Moon*, and every one of the *Stars* are but the images and resemblances of another moon and of other stars intelligible.”

“Philo indeed† Platonized so far, as to suppose God to have made an archetypal and intelligible world before he made this corporeal and sensible; (for he says:) God intending to make a visible world, first formed an intelligible one; that so having an incorporeal and most godlike pattern before Him, He might make the corporeal world agreeably to the same, this younger an image of that older, that should contain as many sensible kinds in it, as the other did intelligible. But it is not possible, saith he, to conceive this world of ideas to exist in any place.—Nay, according to him, Moses himself philosophized after the same manner in his *Cosmopœia*, describing in the first five verses of *Genesis* the making of an intelligible heaven and earth before the sensible. (For, says he), the Creator first of all made an incorporeal heaven and an invisible earth; the ideas of air and vacuum; incorporeal water and air; and last of all *Light* which was also the incorporeal and intelligible paradigm of the *Sun* and *Stars*, and that from whence their sensible light is derived.”

The consequence of this doctrine was, says Cudworth, that in the sensible sign they professed to worship the Divine Idea; in the visible Sun, the Divine Sun. Accordingly even Julian believed that “from‡ the first and chief Deity was produced a certain intelligible and Archetypal *Sun*, which hath the same

\* *Ibid.*, ii., p. 488, 34.

† *Ibid.*, iii., 48.

‡ *Ibid.*, ii., 34, 522.

the sensible Sun existed; their belief would have been only in the *mundus sensibilis*, and every vestige of faith in God as the Supreme Good, would have been swept from their minds.

We are, however, further told that "Philostratus to speak of a double Sun, Moon, and Heaven, as Julian did, the one sensible, the other intelligible; for both acknowledged that "men ought not to see and contemplate the heaven and the world with the same eyes that oxen and horses do; but so that that which is visible to their outward senses to see and discover another invisible nature underneath. Would that modern Literalists took a lesson from these Pagans; surely by the intelligible, "Divine Idea," we are not to suppose that he meant the natural or physical sciences, such as astronomy, zoology, botany, geology, and so forth, for a knowledge answering to that which in the New Testament is called spiritual and which is

We now come to the Fifth stage in the process of bringing the mind out of Chaos into Paradise.

20. "*And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven.* 21. *And God created great whales, and every living thing that moveth which the waters brought forth abundantly,*" etc.

It has been observed by some philosophers, that if there existed no animals, the human mind would be far more incomprehensible than it is; and they have consequently studied the natural history of animals, in order to make themselves better acquainted with the corresponding qualities of human nature. So with regard to the anatomical structure of the human frame; every structure in the animal world has been studied for the purpose of shewing its place in the animal kingdom, and its relation to man. Nothing would be regarded as more arbitrary, or unscientific, than to lay down a theory before hand that some animal organisms have relation to man, and some, not; and in virtue of this theory to select what examples we pleased, and regard these only as related to the structure of the human body.

Yet this is what has been done in theology. A few isolated examples have been selected in illustration of the moral and spiritual nature of man: these are regarded as exceptions to the rest of the animal creation; the consequence has been, the application of a principle of Correspondence in a few select cases, to the exclusion of nearly the whole animal creation from the same law. It is for this reason, that we

have first endeavored to establish universal principles—principles which comprehend the lowest as well as the highest forms of animal life, the *fish* of the sea, the *fowls* of the air, and the *beasts* of the earth: all having their place in the order of Correspondence. In so doing, we have only regarded Theology as standing in a relation toward the animal world as universal as that of Zoology. Nay, in this respect, the Word of God has preceded the discoveries of Science; for in describing the moral and spiritual state of the Church, the whole animal world has been, as it were, laid under contribution; it has made no more exceptions in illustrating the nature of man, than has Science itself. With these preliminary remarks, we proceed to observe: that—

*Water* is an element which is intermediate between the air and the earth: it may be called therefore a denser atmosphere, and indeed is the lowest in which living creatures respire. It is to this denser atmosphere that the *scientiæ* of the natural mind correspond, and hence that they are the lowest forms of spiritual thought. There are those who have regarded even the material element of water as the earliest abode of animal life; and certainly it is in this Chapter regarded as symbolizing the earliest abode of spiritual life, or spiritual life as a life, like that of fishes, on its earliest and lowest scale. There is no more absurdity in regarding the life of fishes in this respect as representing the earliest beginnings of spiritual life, than there is in regarding the vertebræ of fishes as foreshadowing those of man: for, in a scientific point of view, the life of fishes is to the animal life of man, as

the structure of fishes to that of the human body. Before the relation was discovered of the ichthyic structure to that of the human frame, no perceptible relation might be discovered between fishes and man, and thus the passages in Scripture relating to fishes would be regarded only as metaphorical, sometimes to a degree of absurdity.—“The\* fear of you shall be on all the *fishes* of the sea”—“the† *fishes* of the sea and the *fowls* of heaven, and the *beasts* of the field, and all *creeping things* that creep upon the earth, shall shake at my presence,” &c. “The‡ *fishes* of the sea shall be taken away;” “I will§ consume the *fishes* of the sea.” In some cases the *fishes* were seen in vision, that is to say, in representative forms in the Spiritual World; and in that world they have as much relation to the mind of man, as in this world to the body of man.

Hence the *Glossa* observes—By *waters* are signified knowledges, of which some are speculative and are signified by *birds*; and some practical (*i. e.*, external) which are signified by *fishes*.

Haymo likewise explains as follows the passage in the Apocalypse xv. 3 :—

“‘*Every living soul died in the sea,*’—is to be understood of those only, who, in reading the law, attend to nothing else but the letter, as did the Jews; but who ceased to be dead, especially from that time in which they began to live as believers, through the medium of its spiritual senses.”

*Fishes* therefore represent those external truths of

\* Gen. ix. 2.

† Ezek. xxxvi. 20.

‡ Hosea iv. 3.

§ Zephaniah i. 3.

the Word of God in the natural mind, which are animated by the earliest influxes of spiritual life.

When animated by a spiritual life they are in their own divine order; but when they represent not truths, but fables, they are spiritual monsters of the deep, sharks, behemoth, leviathan, the creations of self-intelligence. Hence in order to exhibit the frightful nature of such mental deformities, "Though\* they dig into hell, saith the Lord, thence shall mine hand take them—though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence will I command the *serpent* and he shall bite them."—Accordingly, when speaking of the power of God in destroying these monsters of the human mind, the Psalmist observes, "Thou didst divide the sea by thy strength: thou brakest the heads of the *dragons* in the waters. Thou brakest the heads of *leviathan* in pieces, and gavest him as meat for the people inhabiting the wilderness"—the giant powers of darkness who feed upon these gigantic falsehoods. We may philosophize as we please upon the nature of good and evil, but no abstract speculations are calculated to inspire such terror into the human mind, and such awe at the power of Omnipotence over these spirits of darkness, as the representations here given; and which, as in the case of the Dragon, are representative forms, actually visible in the Spiritual World.

We may, likewise, upon this principle understand the history of Jonah and the whale; for as "Jonah was three days and three nights in the *whale's* belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three

\* *Amos* ix. 2, 3.

nights in the heart of the earth ;" by which is signified a plenary absorption into those external *scientiæ*, which were represented by the *whale*, from out of which the Lord emerged by his own Divine Power, and was hence enabled to remove from man those spirits of darkness which corresponded to these forms, and by which these evils had been brought upon the earth.

In most of these instances *fishes* have been taken in an evil sense ; but in the first chapter of Genesis they are taken in a good sense, as we read also in the vision of Ezekiel : " And it shall come to pass that every thing that liveth, which moveth, whithersoever the rivers come, shall live, and there shall be a very great multitude of *fish*, because their waters shall come thither ;"—referring to the abundant increase of human knowledges, and their animation by good affections.

With respect to the winged *fowl* which the waters are to bring forth, and which are to fly in the open expanse of heaven, they are representations of thoughts of a higher kind ; for they fly above the earth, and ascend to heavenly things.

" Thought,\* discursive and excursive thought, that is not confined to the contemplation of things of earth, things that are immediately about us, but can elevate itself to heaven, and the heavenly bodies, not only to those of our own system, but can *take flights* beyond the bounds of time and space, and enter into the Holy of Holies, and contemplate Him who sitteth upon the cherubim, the throne of the Deity."

In describing the range of thought we naturally

\* Kirby's *Bridgewater Treatise*, vol. i. Introduction, p. 30.



fall into expressions of this kind, because of the correspondence between the sign and the thing signified: hence the elevation of mind acquired by those who wait upon the Lord—"They that wait upon the Lord shall mount up with *wings* as *eagles*." The ground and reason of this expression is, that in the mind there is an expanse; that this expanse has its own proper height and depth, length and breadth, in which take place corresponding motions of elevation or depression.

As the *Waters* bring forth the fish and the fowl, so the *earth* brings forth the wild beast and creeping thing after his kind.

On the third day a distinction was made between the *waters* and the *dry land*, or between the *seas* and the *earth*: the same distinction is here maintained. The *waters* are the *scientiæ* of the natural mind; the *earth* the affections of the will; for which reason, as we have seen, it represents an honest and good heart. We need not say how the heart has been represented as the abode of good or evil affections; of the lamb, the kid, the dove, and every clean and domesticated animal; or of the wolf, the tiger, the fox, and every wild and unclean creature. A knowledge of these animals, and of what they represent would furnish us with a knowledge of the corresponding qualities of the human mind. This is the more important for us to remember, because, as we shall see, the retrogression of the human mind is represented as having been effected by means of one of these animals, namely, a *serpent*, included under the expression "every creeping thing."

Thus, as there is said to be an orderly distribution of the parts of human bodies throughout the organic kingdoms of nature; so there is a like distribution of qualities of the animal nature of man, representing, according as they are good or evil, those of a corresponding spiritual nature. Metaphysicians may prefer their own abstract terms; but it is a fact, that the method employed by Scripture in describing and teaching the nature of the voluntary and intellectual faculties is not by abstract, but by concrete terms, not by logical and metaphysical language (for this kind of language was not yet invented in primeval times), but by the objects of the visible world employed as signs, upon the principle of Correspondence—a principle in harmony with that of the Ancient Philosophy.

Thus in regard to the animal creation Cudworth observes;—

... "We find\* in Origen, that, as the Egyptian theologians called their religious animals symbols of the eternal ideas, so did they also call them *symbols of God*. Celsus applauds the Egyptian theologians talking so magnificently and mysteriously of those brute animals worshipped by them, and affirming them to be certain *symbols of God*." In due time the symbolical meaning was lost, and then succeeded the worship of the sign instead of the thing signified; or, in the words of the Apostle, "They worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator." In what respect the animal kingdom symbolized the attributes of Deity, we may see in the case of the Cherubim where four

\* *Intellectual System*, ii., 549.

animals are represented as full of eyes before and behind; the first animal was like a lion, the second like a calf, the third had a face as a man, and the fourth was like a flying eagle: the first signifying Divine power: the second Divine affection: the third Divine Wisdom: the fourth Divine intelligence. However variously interpreted, these animals are generally regarded as symbolizing Divine qualities.

Now, we have seen from the doctrine of *Typical Forms and Special Adaptations*, that the whole animal kingdom has relation to MAN, and this by reason of organic correspondences:

“Professor\* Agassiz, after declaring that as yet we scarcely possess the most elementary information requisite for a scientific comparison of the instincts and faculties of animals with those of Man, confesses that he cannot say in what the mental faculties of a child differ from those of a young chimpanzee. He also observes, that the range of the passions of animals is as extensive as that of the human mind; and I am at a loss to perceive a difference of *kind* between them, however much they may differ in degree, and in the manner in which they are expressed. The gradations among the moral faculties among the higher animals and Man are, moreover, so imperceptible, that to deny to the first a certain sense of responsibility and consciousness, would certainly be an exaggeration of the difference between animals and Man.”

Unquestionably Man, in his animal state, is an animal. But he has the faculty of acquiring knowledge; and the knowledges thus acquired the Spirit

\* *Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man*, by Sir Charles Lyell, p. 493.

of God incubates. Can we say this of the animal creation? Can we say that spiritual light enters from above into its acquired knowledge, and enables it to perceive the existence of another world above the visible? Can it perceive the distinctions between intellect and will? Can it act from fixed principles of spiritual light and life? We are told, that "most of the arguments of philosophy in favor of the immortality of Man, apply equally to the permanency of this principle in other living beings." But what is the immortality of Man? "*This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*"—"He that liveth and believeth in me shall never die;" and why not? Because,—"*Yet not I live, but Christ liveth in me.*"—Immortality, according to the Scriptures, is not continued existence, but something more—it is the life of God in the spirit of man; and therefore, even supposing the existence of animals to be continued hereafter, they never could have immortality in the same sense with Man; nor could they enjoy a life in heaven, unless they had been endowed upon earth with the power of distinguishing heavenly things from earthly, and suffering the earthly to be ruled by the heavenly; in which case they would be no longer animals but men. Animals, therefore, may be representatives of the spiritual life, but can never be more.

26. "*And God said, Let us make man in our image after our likeness.*"—"By the image of God," says the *Glossa*, "is signified faith and by likeness love; for love transforms the one who loves into the one who is loved." The image of God therefore has

relation to truth, the *likeness* of God to love ; in the present case the love of the truth as it is in Him. Hence Cudworth, speaking of the three essentials of the Deity, says—"The first whereof is infinite *Goodness* with fecundity ; the second infinite *Knowledge* and *Wisdom* ; and the last infinite active and perceptive *Power*."\* This is the Trinity in God ; and corresponding to this is the trinity in man, of love, wisdom, and power ; the first having relation to the will, the second to the understanding, the third to external action.

This Trinity, as we have seen, was shadowed forth in the Tabernacle as containing the Holy of Holies, the Sanctuary, and the Court ; the Tabernacle, being after the pattern of things in the Heavens, exemplified corresponding divisions in the heavens themselves, that is, corresponding orders of the angelic hosts in accordance with the three Divine attributes of Love, Wisdom, and Power ; hence the ancient classification of the Heavens into three ; which Lord Bacon thus notices in his *De Augmentis Scientiarum* :†—

"To proceed to that which is next in order from God to spirits. We find, as far as credit is to be given to the celestial hierarchy of that supposed Dionysius, the senator of Athens, the first place or degree is given to the angels of *Love*, which are termed Seraphim : the second to the angels of *Light*, which are termed Cherubim ; and the third, and so following places, to thrones, principalities, and the rest, which are all angels of *Power* and *Ministry* ; so as the angels of Knowledge and Illumination are placed before the angels of Office and Domination ;"—

\* *Intellectual System*, i., p. 426.

† p. 54, Montagu's Ed.

And we may add, the angels of Love before the angels of Light.

We may thus see the correspondence between God-man and the creature man; for in God the human attributes, Love, Wisdom, and Power are Divine; in man they are creaturely: in both the three essentials are called by the same names.

But how can the Creator, on this occasion, be called *God-man*? Did he not become God-man only at the Incarnation? We have already answered in part this question; and we here further observe, that Our Lord said to Philip, "*He that hath seen me, hath seen my Father also.*"—"Thus Manoah," as Bishop Horsley observes, "having seen the Jehovah-Angel, said with truth he had seen Elohim. We may add with respect to both these passages, what Mr. Parkhurst has remarked of the second, that the Word *Elohim* is applied to the second Person singly, as the representative of the whole Trinity." Now\* the angel which appeared to Manoah is called "a Man of God:" thus our Lord as God-man, and His Person as such, is representative of the whole Trinity. This God-man is the Archetypal form, to which all created forms have more or less relation; thus not only that of the spirit of man, but of the material body in the sense in which we have already explained it.

\* Dörner says of this doctrine, "One would suppose that if God were originally and essentially Man, he cannot need afterwards to become Man" (Div. ii., vol. ii., p. 333). To which we reply, that originally and essentially God-man was the Word, but not the Word made flesh.—"And Jacob was left alone, and there wrestled a *Man* with him until the breaking of the day," Gen. xxxii. 24.

This brings us to a further explanation of the words, "*And God said.*"

As the revelation of God to man is through the medium of a human form, so this revelation is one not only of Godhead but of manhood. To suppose that a humanity united with Divinity would receive no illustration of its own nature, and would remain as obscurely known to man as if it were in a state of total separation from Deity, would be absurd. And, therefore, when humanity is presented to our contemplation either in union with Deity (in which case it is Divine), or in relation to Deity, as the created image and likeness of God, we behold it in altogether a new aspect, and are presented with an Anthropology very different from that which would otherwise present itself.

This Anthropology is the one which is presented to us in the first chapter of Genesis: it is the relation of the sensuous, rational, and voluntary powers of man to their original; of the type to the Archetype; of man as a spirit to God-man as a spirit; and, therefore, it necessarily treats of the spiritual relation of man to God, and of the laws and order of spiritual things. This is that view of the human mind which is peculiar to a book which claims to be a Revelation of God; and every system of philosophy of the human mind is either true or false in proportion as it receives or rejects these fundamental principles. To contemplate the human mind apart from that of which it is the image and likeness, can only lead to false ideas. That in virtue of which man is man, is his being the image and likeness of God. Until, therefore, he is

created into this image and likeness he is not man actually, but only potentially; and if he denies the existence of God, he denies the existence of man; for man being the image and likeness of God, if there be no God, he is in the image and likeness of nothing; and man is not man, but a fool—he is his own idol, and an idol is nothing.

We have now traced the development and progress of the human mind from its primordial and sensuous state, to that in which it is created in the image and likeness of God; and are thus enabled to reconcile two opposite and contending theories respecting the origin and primeval state of man:

"When animals,"\* says Horace, "first crept forth from the newly formed earth, a dumb and filthy herd, they fought for acorns and lurking places with their nails and fists, then with clubs, and at last with arms which, taught by experience, they had forged. They then *invented names for things, and words to express their thoughts*; after which they began to desist from war, to fortify cities, and enact laws. They who in later times have embraced a similar theory, have been led to it by no deference to the opinions of their pagan predecessors, but rather in spite of very strong prepossessions in favor of an opposite hypothesis, namely, that of the superiority of their original progenitors, of whom they believe themselves to be the corrupt and degenerate descendants."

That is, as I understand, they did so believe themselves, before they were led to adopt the opposite hypothesis.

The characters which most obviously distinguish

\* *Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man.* By Sir Charles Lyell. p. 379.



man from the brute are, according to a French physiologist—

...“The\* abstract notion of good and evil, right and wrong, virtue and vice, or the moral faculty, and a belief in a world beyond ours, and in certain mysterious beings, or a Being of a higher nature than ours, whom we ought to fear or revere; in other words, the religious faculty.”

“Animals† are born what they are intended to remain. Nature has bestowed upon them a certain rank, and limited the extent of their capacity by an impassable decree. Man she has empowered and obliged to become the artificer of his own rank in the scale of beings, by the peculiar gift of improvable reason.”

But whence arose in man the notion of good and evil, right and wrong, virtue and vice? Whence the moral faculty, the belief in God and in a world beyond this? How was it that the primeval man became the artificer of his own rank? And if his reason were improveable, what was the method by which it was improved? Interpret the first chapter of Genesis in the literal sense only, and we are left as much in the dark upon these subjects as ever: interpret the chapter in the spiritual sense, and all these questions are answered. Whether there was any portion of the human race still left in the sensuous state; whether there were other portions who reached only to some particular stage in the progression, it is not necessary at present to state; but one thing is certain, that there were those who advanced from the animal state, through the rational to the spiritual, or to the image and likeness of God;

\* *Ibid.*, p. 496.

† *Ibid.*, p. 497.

whence also the name of *Adam*, as including the two sexes.

We are here reminded by a modern writer that :\*—

"If the formation of a body corporate or polity be the *end of creation*, and the happiness of man depend upon admission into this polity, not upon an abstract recognition of truth, or individual and detached morality; then we see at once the reason why the Christian revelation is presented to *man* as it is presented, through the medium of the *Christian Church*."†

And was not Adam himself a Church? Or, if we regard the name as generic, must there not have been an Adamic Church? In either case was this Church an automaton?

True it is, that it was by Divine *volition* that the processes of Creation were carried on; and all the way through, we have explained these processes on the ground of the freedom of man not being interfered with. In what way, then, are we to understand that God made man in his own image and likeness, so as not to interfere with human freedom? for if He willed man to be so made, who, it may be asked, was there to resist His will?—In answer to this, we are told that, "When‡ God gave His Divine benediction to His creatures, and said, 'Increase and multiply,' God so speaking signified only that their natures were so constituted."—"Consider,"§ says Musculus, "that God is here speaking to the inhabitants of the water; an extraordinary way of speaking certainly.

\* Dr. Sewell's *Christian Vestiges of Creation*. p. 146.

† So also Swedenborg's *Divine Love and Wisdom*, art. 328.

‡ Glasse's *Philologia Sacra*. p. 1563. § *Ibid*.

Not, however, that He spake to their organs of hearing, but to those powers of nature by which He imparted naturally, by the word of His power, the capacity of propagating their kind." Hence he adds, "that the word of God is the Divine power and efficacy conspicuous in the creation and conservation of the creatures." Augustin all but furnishes the very interpretation we have before given of the expression, "*God said*:"—"It\* is the unchangeable Truth either ineffably speaking by itself to the mind of the rational creature, or else speaking by the mutable creature; whether by *spiritual images addressed to our spirit*, or by vocal sounds addressed to the bodily sense."—We have already represented the language of God, as being addressed to the spirit of man by spiritual images, whether representative (as in the case of St. John in the Apocalypse), or as an influx of truths (ideas) from the Spirit of God into the human mind. These interior ideas constituted interior thought, which we have spoken of as interior language.

Accordingly, as the communication of truth to the mind is represented by God *speaking*, so the reception and intellection of those truths is represented by man *hearing*: "I† will *hear* what God the Lord will speak, for He shall speak peace unto His people and to His saints."—"He‡ that is of God *heareth* God's words."—"Hear§ and your soul shall live."—"I|| speak to the world those things which I have *heard* of him."—"They¶ shall be all taught of God.

\* *Ibid.* † Psalm lxxxv. 8.

|| John viii. 26.

‡ John viii. 47.

§ Isaiah lv. 3.

¶ John vi. 25.

Every man, therefore, that hath *heard* and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me."—It is in this sense both that God *speaks* to man, and that man *hears* what he says. When, therefore, we read that *God said*, "Let us make man in our image," etc., by this expression is signified the disposition of man to receive and the consequent reception of that influx of truth and love, in virtue of which he would be in the image of God after His likeness. On this ground we may understand the moral responsibility of the human mind.

For lay down as we may the principles of right and wrong, virtue and vice, truth and falsehood, good and evil; declare them to be founded upon eternal and immutable distinctions; yet what would be the use of all this, unless there were something in the primeval constitution of man to enable him to recognize these principles? Would it not be as useless as to create the light without creating an eye, or sound when there was no organ of hearing?

To say that man was made all at once and miraculously in the image and likeness of God; that this image and likeness consisted in a sudden endowment with rational faculties; and that while all the rest of organic nature was made in relation to the model of the human form, the human form was after no model at all, is to contravene every principle of philosophy, science, and theology.

In order to attain, therefore, to the image and likeness of God, it was essential to man not only that he should be originally in the image and likeness of God, but that he should see how it was that he should

be so made ; because he could not have been so made, except in the exercise of his own freedom, and the co-operation of his own rational faculties. Could we suppose God to have so made him, and yet to have kept him in ignorance of this subject, self-knowledge would have been a thing impossible ; and he would have pursued an unintelligent course of rectitude, just in the same manner as a body once impelled to motion, would by its *vis inertiae* (so called) have moved on in a straight line for ever. To say that the free choice of the primeval man was exercised only in the loss of spiritual life, and not at all in the acquirement of it ; that he was so created as to be free to choose evil, and yet not free to choose good ; is only to say that he was free to lose his freedom, but not to gain it—free to die, but not free to live. In that case the very nature of good and evil must have been altogether different from the nature of good and evil as it now is : which is impossible.

If, then, man were brought into the gradual perception of good and evil, truth and error, it was of the utmost importance that he should see and know how that perception was created within him ; for a revelation of truth would have been to him of no service, unless there had been first formed in him the faculty of perception ; and we have already seen that perception and volition go hand in hand. Were the case otherwise, there would have been no use of this narrative : it would have been no use for man to know by what process God originally made him good, and wise, and innocent, for of his original goodness, wisdom, and innocence, man could have had no

volition; and if no volition, no perception; and if no perception, no moral responsibility.

There is, therefore, an absolute necessity for the spiritual sense of this Chapter, after the manner in which we have explained it.

29. "*And God said, Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.*"

"The partaking of all kinds of herbs and trees for food," says a modern writer,\* "signified the acquisition of knowledge. The same explanation applies to the partaking of all kinds of animals, and to the distinguishing between one kind and another (Gen. ix. 3). But here the difference in the quality of the food is also significant. As herbs are proper for the weak, and meat for the strong, so knowledge is of different degrees, varying by course of time in the same individual, and varying also in the world generally."

So again on the words—"Let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth."

... "The literal subjugation of the objects named is not meant, but rather the subjugation of the qualities and affections of man's corporeal nature which they represent. These, for the time present, are antagonistic to his spiritual perfection, and will continue to be so, till in the end they are all brought

\* *Creation in Plan and Progress; being an Essay on the First Chapter of Genesis.* By the Rev. James Challis, M.A., F.R.S., F.R.A.S., Plumian Professor of Astronomy and Experimental Philosophy in the University of Cambridge, and late Fellow of Trinity College. p. 89, 90.

into subjection to the Son of Man, and time itself is overcome."

The esoteric method of interpretation which is here applied *partially*, viz., to *particular* passages, Swedenborg, as we have seen, applies to the *whole* chapter; but, says the Plumian Professor,—

"These views may be possibly regarded by the Essayist as coming from a professed mystifier of the school of Philo. I am unacquainted with the writings of Philo, and can assert that the explanations I have proposed are the result of independent research, carried on, with whatever success, under the full persuasion, that there is a Science, fixed and determinate in its principles, to which the words of Scripture stand in the same relation, as facts of observation to the science of Nature. Mysticism is an abuse of this science."

This science is called by Swedenborg the *Science of Correspondence*.

In conclusion :

"Remarkable," it is said,\* "as this narrative is for simple grandeur, it has nothing in it which can be properly called poetical. It bears on its face no trace of mystical or symbolical meaning."—Now admitting, for the sake of argument, this to be true, it may be useful so see what is the relation between the Literalist of the present day, and certain Pagans in times of old. We have seen that according to Julian and others—Pagans as they were—"men ought not to view and contemplate heaven and the world with the same eyes that oxen and horses do, but so as from that which is visible to their outward senses

\* *Essays and Reviews*, p. 222.

to discern and discover another invisible nature under .” They were not speaking of the first chapter of Genesis; but independently of this chapter they believed that the external world was the sign of an internal world; external and visible Nature, the sign of an internal invisible nature. Hence their belief in a Supreme Good, and invisible world. The modern Literalist has now found out that all this was superstition and mysticism, arising from their mistaking metaphors for symbols: that Nature has but one meaning, and that one meaning proper to physical Science. They again, therefore, might regard our modern Christian as looking upon heaven and earth with no other eyes than oxen and horses do; for it is not the province of the Physical sciences to treat of an invisible nature under the visible. The question then may be put quite independently of the first chapter of Genesis: and we ask, Were these Pagans right, or were they deluded, when they believed this outward world to symbolize an inward? If they were right, whom would they regard as contemplating heaven and earth with the same eyes that oxen and horses do? or as giving them the alternative between being cattle or mystics? For if the Literalist said to these Pagans:—

“You are only professed mystifiers of the school of Philo:” they might rejoin, “And are not you of the school of oxen and horses?” No! you reply in the words of Lord Bacon—

“For\* as all works do shew forth the power and skill of the workman, but not his image; so it is with the works of God, which do shew the Omnipotency and wisdom of the

\* *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, p. 129. Montagu's Ed.



Maker, but not his image; and therefore therein the heathen opinion differeth from the sacred truth; for they supposed the world to be the image of God, and man to be an extract or compendious image of the world; but the Scriptures never vouchsafe to attribute to the world that honor as to be the image of God, but only the work of his hands; neither do they speak of any other image of God but man; wherefore by the contemplation of Nature to induce and enforce the acknowledgement of God, and to demonstrate His power, providence, and goodness, is an excellent argument, and hath been excellently handled by divers."

According to this account, Inductive Science never travels further than Natural Theology: it leads men away from the mysticism of Plato and the Pythagoreans, to the laws of Nature as established by observation and experiment. This method of interpreting Nature was in complete harmony with the literal method of interpreting Scripture; and for some centuries the two have proceeded hand in hand. What has been the result? The degradation of Scripture, and the exaltation of Nature. We say the degradation of Scripture: because the first chapter of Genesis has upon this principle lost its authority, and together with it a large portion of Scripture; and thus while Scripture has been sinking more and more into a state of abject and lifeless literalism, inductive science has been advancing more and more to the very altitudes of the Platonic philosophy.

"We have here,"\* says the author of *Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation*, "a class of phenomena to which

\* p. 27.

Paley has never once alluded in his *Natural Theology*, and which are referred to only in an incidental manner, and without their meaning being apprehended, in one or two passages of the *Bridgewater Treatises*. The authors of these works are not to be blamed for this omission; for in their day the facts had not been discovered, or, at least, admitted into acknowledged Science. But now that they have taken their place, and that a very high place, among settled doctrines, it is time to examine their religious import and tendency. They will be found not to be isolated or exceptional in their character, but to belong to a large and wide spread class, with a deep theological signification."

What is the deep theological signification which it is time to examine, we have already seen. It is further set before us by another writer, eminent in Natural Science, as follows:—

"Pythagoras\* was far from wrong, when he sought for mystic relations between the soul of man and the sensible world; for he imagined that the soul would find within itself a copy of all outside it, and in this respect he believed man to be a *microcosm* or compendium of the Universe."

"Plato conceived that there are substances (*οὐσίαι*) invisible, incorporeal, supermundane, divine, and eternal, which he calls ideas, i.e., forms, exemplars, and causes of all these natural and sensible things, the former being the truths, and the latter the images."

The late Professor Archer Butler regarded this doctrine of Plato as containing within it a "mighty substance of imperishable truth." Such are the principles to which Inductive Science is now gradually advancing; and if the Baconian philosophy ever led

\* *The Typical Character of Nature, or All Nature a Divine Symbol*, p. 113, 137. By Dr. Balfour.

away the scientific world from these principles, it was only that, by a marvellous Providence, it might in due time return to them again, having confirmed them by its own independent testimony. Inductive science is thus leading men from earth to heaven; and for any one to charge these principles with Gnosticism, is only to shew that the very first day's work of Creation in discriminating between light and darkness, has not yet been achieved in his mind. "The\* internal man is formed in the image of heaven," says Swedenborg, "and the external in the image of the world; insomuch that the internal man is a heaven in the least form, and the external is a world in the least form, thus a *microcosm*." Now the external man is the same with the natural or animal man; and when the ancient heathens said, that we ought not to look upon Nature with the same eyes that oxen and horses do, they were only reprobating, in the interpretation of Nature, the same erroneous principle which the apostle alluded to in the interpretation of the truths of Revelation, when he said,—“The natural man perceiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.” Natural or animal men under the Christian dispensation, are the oxen and horses of the ancient heathen religion, and *vice versâ*.

The world demonstrates then the power, wisdom, and goodness of God as principles of natural theology; but this is not all: over and above this it has a deep spiritual or esoteric meaning. The heathens of the school of Philo knew this; and the advance of

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 6057. See the whole article.

natural Science has confirmed it. This is one of the signs of the times—the herald of a new era. For, as Cudworth observes\*—"There be many that speak of new glimpses and discoveries of truth, of dawnings of Gospel light; and no question but God hath revealed much of this for the very evening and sunset of the world; for in the latter days knowledge shall be increased."

If then, as some maintain, the proper method of interpreting Scripture be the same with the proper method of interpreting Nature; there are two methods of interpreting Nature, the scientific and the esoteric; and the former, in consequence of modern discoveries, has furnished important evidence of the latter. Nay, but it is said, "If words have more than one meaning, they may have any meaning."—Grant this, and then the object of a large class of literalists is to shew that the Scriptures can have but one meaning only, and that this one meaning is Geologically untrue.

We quite agree, indeed, that "It would† have been well if theologians had made up their minds to accept frankly the principle, that those things for the discovery of which man has faculties specially provided, are not fit objects for a Divine revelation." It is for this reason that we have not at all been anxious to trace in the first chapter of Genesis the Geological history of gases, mud, granite, coral, or coal; nor can we see that its divine Inspiration is at all affected because we cannot trace in it the Cambrian, Devonian, and Silurian strata. We say to the Literalists—Apply

\* Sermon i.

† *Essays and Reviews*, p. 209.

to yourselves your own principles; and if, as you maintain, Geology ought not to be sought for in Revelation, why do you seek for it; and then say, because the Geology you seek is not there, it is not a Revelation? But some of you say that a Geology is there, and that it is false. To this Philo might certainly reply—‘Whether true or false, it is your antecedent denial of any esoteric meaning in Creation that causes you to be more concerned, in the first chapter of Genesis, about the Old Red Sandstone, than about your new creation in righteousness and true holiness.’

We, however, whom you would call the “professed mystifiers of the school of Philo,” agree with you and others upon many important points: you say, for instance, that the\* great object of Scripture was “to tell man of his origin and fall, and to draw his mind to his Creator and Redeemer;” that Scripture was not designed to teach us physical Science, and that “it is vain to attempt to make a Cosmogony out of its statements;” that any true† doctrine of Inspiration must conform to, not contradict, the well-ascertained facts of history and science; that what‡ we give up as a general principle (the esoteric meaning for instance), we shall find it impossible to maintain partially; that a§ little more or a little less of the mystical method does not make the difference between certainty and uncertainty in the Interpretation of Scripture; that a|| change in some of the prevailing modes of Interpretation of

\* *Essays and Reviews*, p. 235.

† *Ibid.*, p. 348.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 419.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 369.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 418.

Scripture, is not so much a matter of expediency as of necessity.

Here, however, we remark, that the prevailing mode of interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis is the literal: a mode common to those who deny, as well as to those who maintain, the Geological truth of the first chapter of Genesis. It is upon the interpretation resulting from this method, that you both disagree. If you call upon others to give up this literal interpretation, you must give it up yourselves. For if you say that you ought not to *look* for Geology in Revelation, you ought not to attempt to *find* it there; no matter whether the Geology you profess to find be true or false. In this case both parties are silenced; the melancholy spectacle is no longer witnessed, of making the whole superstructure of Christianity to rest upon Geological interpretations; and we can admit with a very composed mind the remark, that "he\* who notices the circumstance that the explanations of the first chapter of Genesis have slowly changed, and, as it were, retreated before the advance of Geology, will be unwilling to add another to the spurious reconcilements of Science and Revelation."

It is remarkable that Literalism occasions the same controversy with regard to the END of all things, as with regard to the BEGINNING of all things.—"*In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*, is not more a matter of controversy than the words, "*I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and there was no more sea.*"—"A recent commentator on

\* *Ibid.*, p. 341.

Scripture (says Mr. Jowett) appears\* willing to peril religion on the literal truth of such an expression as, '*We shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air.*' Would he be equally ready to stake Christianity on the literal meaning of the words, '*Where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched?*' "

Mr. Jowett has intimated that "there† are signs that times are changing, and that we are changing too;" that even "the‡ intellectual forms under which Christianity has been described, are in a state of transition and resolution."—"If it§ has been said with an allowable hyperbole, that Homer is Greece, with much more truth may it be said that the Bible is Christendom."—As then the state of Christendom is one of transition, so, we are left to infer, is that of the Bible.—Not so, says another: "historically the Bible is neither antecedent to nor independent of the Church: it is the production of the Church. The Church in fact creates the Bible; for not only is the Bible actually written by members of the Church, but whatever Divine authority it possesses, it derives from the Church." That the Church has, in any sense, created what is commonly called the Word of God; that the Word of God has in this respect its origin in the word of man, and the Divine authority of Scripture in the human authority of councils, Sceptics in general would be willing to grant; and in this respect there might be a greater cordiality between the two parties than would otherwise seem; nor do we deny that where the inner meaning of Scripture is taken

\* *Ibid.*, p. 403.

† *Ibid.*, p. 421.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 420.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 406.

y, the authority imparted to it by the Church is what remains. In this case, the Inspiration of the Book is entirely dependent upon the testimony of the Church; although the Church acknowledges, in the present day, that it will not venture to say in what Inspiration consists.

The Essayist affirms that\* the meaning of Scripture is one thing, the Inspiration of Scripture another: Donaldson says, "Both† Clement of Alexandria and Origen regarded the Divine or spiritual element in Scripture as belonging to the *inner meaning*." . . . then the Church denies this inner meaning, it denies the divine or spiritual element in Scripture; this in its very character as a steward of the secrets of God. Is it then strange that, under such circumstances, the admonition should be heard, "How is it that I hear this of thee? Give an account of thy stewardship?" Primevally, indeed, the Church existed before the Book; the wisdom of God was written upon the heart before it was written upon paper; and if the inner truths of the Bible were verily written upon the heart of the Church, the Church might then be a living witness to the Book: but God foresaw that, in successive ages, the wisdom would be obliterated from the Church, and would be left only in a Book; and that if the Book were to pass away, there would be nothing left by which the Church would bear witness; consequently, that the office of witness would cease.

We have seen, that the great principle upon which the parties maintain the literal sense, is, that the

\* *Ibid.*, p. 350.

† *Christian Orthodoxy*, p. 314.



narrative in Genesis bears on its face every indication of being written as plain matter of fact *history*. But if, in order to interpret any writing, we must refer it to the times in which it was written, and see how they would interpret it for whom it is written; surely it is as incumbent upon Geologists as upon others to do the same; and if to say it was never understood properly till modern discoveries came to explain it, be a false position for theologians, it is equally a false position for Geologists; and both parties are equally bound to refer back the narrative to the period in which it was composed. In this case, it becomes an important question, whether the style of writing of that day was altogether the same with that which prevails in the present. We shall see that it was not; and that the circumstance of the narrative being written in an *historical* form, does not militate against its containing an internal sense, but rather the contrary.

. . . "All things contained in the first chapters of Genesis," says Swedenborg,\* "are things reduced to an *historical form*, in the internal sense of which are things Divine concerning the *new creation* or *regeneration* of the man of the celestial Church. This manner of writing was customary in the most ancient times, not only with those who were of the Church, but also with those who were out of the Church; as with the Arabians, the Syrians, and the Grecians, as is evident from the books of those times, both sacred and profane. In imitation of those books, because derived from them, was written the *Song of Songs*

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 9942.

by Solomon ; a book which is not a Sacred Book, as it does not interiorly contain things Celestial and Divine, in a series, like the Sacred Books. The book of Job also is a book of the ancient Church. Mention is made also of books of the ancient Church which are now lost, as in Numbers xxi. 14, etc., the *historicals* of which were called the WARS OF JEHOVAH, and the propheticals, ENUNCIATIONS. That in the *historicals* of those books which were called the *Wars of Jehovah* the style was such, is evident from the quotations thence by Moses. Thus these *historicals* approached to a sort of prophetic style, of such a kind that the subjects might be retained in the memory by infants and by the simple. That the books there cited were sacred, is evident from the things extant therein (verses 28—30) compared with those which are extant in Jeremiah xlviii. 45, 46, where similar things occur. That a style of the same kind was most usual at that time, and was almost the only style with those who were out of the Church, is clear from the fabulous accounts of those writers who were out of the Church, in which they involved *moral* instruction, or such as related to the affections and life.”

Now that *historical* narratives of this kind were prevalent in the early ages of the world, is admitted even by some Literalists themselves ; thus it is said, that “Speculations\* on metaphysical subjects, as well as theories and reflections on the origin and revolutions of the universe, on the *moral* and physical constitution of the world, on the *commencement* and *first*

\* Dr. Davidson's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, vol. i., p. 147. A quotation from Van Bohlen.

*development of the human race*, were clothed, like all the learning of the East, in an *historical dress*." . . . The ground, therefore, taken up by Swedenborg is confirmed by others: we only maintain that the subject thus thrown into an historical form is of a spiritual nature, viz., the progress of man from Chaos to Paradise.\*

"They who do not think beyond the sense of the letter," said Swedenborg nearly a century ago,† "cannot believe otherwise than that the Creation which is described in the first and second chapters of Genesis, denotes the Creation of the (material) Universe; and that there were six days within which were created the heaven, the earth, the sea, and all things which were in them; and at length—man in the likeness of God. But who cannot see, if he duly considers the subject, that it is not the Creation of the visible Universe which is there meant; for such things are there described as may be known from common sense not to have so been; as that before the Sun and Moon there were days, as also light and darkness, and that herbs and trees budded forth; that light was given by those luminaries afterwards; and then, also, a distinction was made between light and darkness, and that days were made in this manner likewise."

We have now stated the origin and reason of the

\* The interesting work of Professor Müller on *Comparative Mythology* in no way interferes with this view of the subject; but it reminds us of a great truth when it says, that in order to know what man is, we ought to know what man has been.

† *Ibid.*, art. 8891.

*external historical form* of the narrative respecting the Creation, and have had to treat of several questions of importance raised by modern controversies with respect to this chapter; but we have come into no collision with any principles of Geology, Ethnology, Astronomy, or any other science; although subjects have been treated of which might easily have led to it upon any other grounds. The Interpretations offered have, indeed, been but of a general nature; nor would our limits have allowed us to enter into detail. Even upon this plan, however, we have been obliged to omit several important subjects which are reserved for the next chapter. In the mean time we observe, that it would have been almost useless to enter into details, so long as general principles were at stake.

The symbolical meaning of the Chapter has been denied by the Essayists. The defenders of the Faith have far too easily given up this important position. This being surrendered, all is surrendered; for the Divine authority of the First Chapter of Genesis becomes then a mere question of Science: the battle of Divine Inspiration has then to be fought on the ground of Geology—a false position, in which the defenders of the faith have been worsted. Indeed—

To subordinate spiritual truth to natural Science, however demonstrable the Science may be, is an inversion of the true order of things. To harmonize the facts of Geology with Geological theories, whether resulting from interpretations of Scripture or not, is not to harmonize Geology with Scripture, but Geology with itself; the natural with the natural, not the

natural with the spiritual; indeed so far from the latter being the case, the natural has banished the spiritual, ignored and contemned it—which is itself the very state of Chaos. To discover, then, a Geological interpretation of Genesis, and in that interpretation to rest, would not be to extricate the Church from Chaos, but to be satisfied with her Chaotic state; and if in consequence of the troubles thence arising, we should say that it is a necessary condition of the Church militant, the Church in this case is militant only against herself.

I can have no doubt that the great purpose of Divine Providence in permitting the present crisis of Christendom, is—to *bring the question of spiritual interpretation to an issue*. Yes! in the words of the Public Orator of Cambridge—"The crisis is at hand—such a crisis as this Church and Nation have not seen for more than two hundred years. It forces itself upon our thoughts. We cannot, if we would, ignore it. We, of all men, are least able to ignore it."

"Of all\* the points in dispute at the present time, the chief is that which relates to the Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture."

"A great preacher told you from the University pulpit last term, that the Bible would be the battle ground of the present generation."

Admirably does the Public Orator conclude, when

\* *Duty of Members of the English Church in the present Controversies*; a Sermon preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Cambridge, Feb. 8, by W. G. Clark, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College and Public Orator in the University of Cambridge. p. 10, 12.

he says—"Therefore we will not fear. At the bidding of the God of Truth, we will seek for truth, at whatever cost."—Will you, then, *at whatever cost*, enquire into the doctrine taught by Swedenborg, according to which there is a spiritual sense in every part of the Word, and owing to which sense it is that the Word is divinely inspired, and holy in every syllable? I am speaking of that doctrine which includes in the Canon those Books of Scripture only which are capable of this interpretation.

This interpretation we have exemplified in the present chapter—an interpretation which is spiritual, not Geological. It is one which relates to the primeval constitution of the mind of man as a religious being. It shews to us the real nature of the human mind, in its progression according to heavenly order; hence also its nature when perverted into a state of infernal disorder. We may trace the development of this infernal disorder in the following manner:

*First day*—the light of the senses and thence of reason. *Second day*—no distinction between things spiritual and natural—natural things only being conceived to exist. *Third day*—an increase of knowledge upon this principle, no distinction being made between the possession of knowledge as the means, and good as the end. *Fourth day*—fixed principles of self-intelligence, self-love, and selfish knowledge; Man being now wise in his own eyes, and prudent in his own sight. *Fifth day*—intellectual creations upon this principle—whence pantheism and naturalism all upon the wing, idolatrous religions, monstrous philo-

sophies, insidious fallacies—being the water-serpents, flying dragons, and leviathans of the deep. *Sixth day*—the wild beasts of the earth, or the concupiscences and untamed passions of the mind, arising from the lust of power desolating the world; man having now changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator: God himself being thus made in the image and likeness of perverted man.

Observe, on the other hand, the orderly history of the mind, beginning from the same original state of Nature. *First day*: a perception, in virtue of a higher light, between sense and rationality. *Second day*: the distinction consequently between heavenly and earthly things; those of heaven being regarded as first in order, and those of earth as subordinate. *Third day*: the acquisition and arrangement of knowledge upon this principle, the result of which is a first effort to bring forth the good works of a new though external life. *Fourth day*: light and love issuing forth from spiritual truths which have become fixed principles, and enlighten the way of life. *Fifth day*: thoughts that breathe with the truth, the natural lusts and passions being opposed. *Sixth day*: all the good affections resulting from a knowledge of the truth, and signified by tame and domesticated animals, or by the clean beasts of the Mosaic law; the creature man being now an image and likeness of the Creator.

Thus has God caused to be recorded, for the edification of the Church, the successive steps by which Man passes out of the region of sense into that of

rationality, and hence onwards to the image and likeness of God.

One would have thought that, in a professedly Christian age, a more practical subject could not have engaged the attention. For how does the case stand? Call it mystical as you may, we affirm that it is HISTORICAL in the highest sense of the term; for it contains the PRIMEVAL HISTORY of the development and progress of the human mind—a HISTORY which serves as a beacon to all other histories; a HISTORY which Christianity is but laboring to realize, in order to effect the restitution of all things; a HISTORY which alone explains the infinite diversities of the human race, and all the mythologies, religions, wars, speculations, philosophies, crimes, and virtues which diversify the annals of the world—a HISTORY OF PROGRESS on the consummation of which the Seven Thunders utter their voices, and the mystery of God is finished.

---





## APPENDIX.

---

PAGE 14.—Professor Wilson observes, in his article upon *Chemical Final Causes*, that—"What we call a final cause is not God's final cause, but only that small corner of it which we can comprehend in our widest glance."—"Final causes, like the vestal virgins, belong to God."—"Nevertheless," says he, "we must seek after and love final causes, even with a lover's passion, although in this life they can never be ours." The *physical* final cause of the organization of the eye is that it may see; of the hearing, that it may hear. The *spiritual* final cause is, that the natural sight may minister to the spiritual sight, the natural hearing to spiritual hearing, and these to the formation of man into the image and likeness of God, who is the Beginning and the Ending, the First and the Last.—See *Religio Chemici*, p. 162, 163.

PAGE 28.—"Every one sees that there is a scale in nature: that animals and plants, by the intervention of an infinity of intermediate forms, gradually blend into each other, and are finally so united that we know not where to draw the line of demarcation. This is an acknowledged truth, known for centuries; but whether this series was *simple*, or whether, in its progress, it branched off into other ramifications, and became *complex*, were questions which long engaged the attention of philosophers. The discoveries, however, of this century have at length set this question also at rest, and decided that the natural series is *complex*, forming in its progress certain deviations which resemble a series of circles."—*A Treatise on the Geography and Classification of Animals*. By William Swainson, Esq. p. 128.

PAGE 41.—Dr. Balfour observes respecting Swedenborg, that—"The subsequent eccentricities of this great man do not detract from the grandeur of the idea with which his mind was filled;" i. e., when he was speaking of the doctrine of representations and correspondences. It would not be difficult to shew that this very doctrine is, according to some, itself the evidence of his eccentricity; and if Dr. Balfour has attempted to shew that this doctrine is *true* nevertheless, he will be regarded as having neutralized, to a very considerable extent, the charge of eccentricity. If Swedenborg's principles are shewn to be *true*, it is of little consequence what may be said against them.—*Typical Character of Nature*, p. 38.

PAGE 42.—"*Two* appears as the typical number in the lowest class of plants, and regulates that pairing or marriage of plants and animals which is one of the fundamental laws of the organic kingdoms. *Three* is the characteristic number of that class of plants which have parallel veined leaves, and is the number of joints in the typical digit. *Four* is a significant number in those beautiful crystals which shew that minerals (as well as stars) have their geometry. *Five* is the model number of the highest class of plants—those with reticulated veins and branches, it is the typical number of the fingers and toes of vertebrate animals, and is of frequent occurrence among star-fishes. *Six* is the proportional number of carbon in chemistry, and  $3 \times 2$  is a common number in the floral organs of monocotyledonous plants, such as the lilies of the field which we are exhorted to consider. *Seven* appears as significant only in a single order of plants (*Hep-tandria*), but has an importance in the animal kingdom, where it is the number of vertebræ in the neck of mammalia, and according to M. Edwards, the typical number of rings in the head, in the thorax, and in the abdomen of crustacea. *Eight* is the definite number in chemical composition for oxygen,

the most universal element in Nature, and is very common in the organs of sea-jellies. *Nine* seems to be rare in the organic kingdoms. *Ten* or  $5 \times 2$  is found in star-fishes, and is the number of digits on the fore and hind limbs of animals. Without going over any more individual numbers, we find *multiple numbers* acting an important part in chemical compositions, and in the organs of flowers; for the elements unite in multiple relations, and the stamens are often the multiples of the petals. In the arrangement of the appendages of the plant we have a strange series, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34, which was supposed to possess virtues of an old date, and before it was discovered in the plant. In natural philosophy the highest law, that of forces acting from a centre, proceeds according to the *square* of numbers. In the curves and relative lengths of branches of plants, there are evidently quantitative relations which mathematics have not been able to seize and express."—*Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation*, p. 534.

PAGE 45.—"Things upon earth" of course here signify those which are in Divine order, and correspond to what is good and true. Such as correspond to what is evil and false, and are thus not in Divine order, represent things in hell and not in heaven.

PAGE 57.—Some have denied the existence of a material Chaos in any sense, and have affirmed that the Newtonian philosophy is adverse to such an hypothesis. That there has been a period of great disorder in the progression of the earth from its primitive to its present state, is generally admitted by Geologists; but writers are not agreed as to the propriety of designating it by the name of *Chaos*, which, as applied to the literal sense of the second verse (Gen. i.) some regard as the result of a mere gratuitous assumption. The term *Chaos* itself is not a scriptural but a classical term; we have made use of it merely to express in brief the *spiritual*

## NOTE.

To the list of recent works in favor of Spiritual Interpretation, mentioned in p. 6, may be added *The Types of Genesis*, by A. Jukes; *a Lectures on the First Chapter of Genesis*, by the Rev. R. Sprang M.A.; and a work by Professor Lewis on *The Divine Human of Scriptures*.

## ERRATA.

- p. 8, l. 14, for "5. The doctrine," read, "5. That the doctrine."
- p. 8, l. 19, for "primæval," read, "primeval."
- p. 11, l. 14, for "primæval," read, "primeval."
- p. 16, l. 18, *erase* "Empedocles is said to have favored this opinion."
- p. 22, l. 3, for "Hugh Millar," read, "Hugh Miller."
- p. 23, l. 8, for "psychichal," read, "psychical."
- p. 35, l. 6, for "homœophites," read, "homœophytes."
- p. 94, *note*, for "Edmund Law," read, "William Law."
- p. 96, reference to the extract concerning Plato mislaid.

# INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION :

BEING

## THE SECOND CHAPTER OF GENESIS

SPIRITUALLY INTERPRETED.

BY THE REV. AUGUSTUS CLISSOLD, M.A.,

FORMERLY OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

No. VI.

"The First Man knew Her not perfectly, no more shall the last find Her out. For Her thoughts are more than the sea, and Her counsels profounder than the great deep."—*Ecclesiasticus* xxiv. 28.

OXFORD :

HENRY HAMMANS, HIGH STREET.

LONDON :

WHITTAKER AND CO.

1863.



LONDON:  
MITCHELL AND SON, PRINTERS,  
WARDOUR STREET, W.

## TO THE READER.

---

I am not ignorant," says St. Augustine,\* "that many writers have said many things concerning Paradise; but their opinions may be generally divided into three different classes. The first, those which maintain that Paradise should be understood in a material sense. The second, those which maintain that it should be understood only in a spiritual sense. The third, those which maintain that it should be understood in both senses, sometimes materially, sometimes spiritually."

Augustine adopts the third method; and in his arguments directed against the Manichees, his language is as follows:—

At the historical sense, facts are narrated; in the prophetic, things future are foretold. Whosoever wishes to understand all parts of the narrative in the literal sense, or to stand them in no other than the direct meaning of the words, and in so doing can avoid blasphemies, and explain things in accordance with the Catholic faith, such a one must not only regard with no disfavor, but esteem as the best who best understands the subject, and as highly de-

\* *De Genesi ad literam*, lib. iv.

† *De Genesi contra Manichæos*, lib. ii.



serving commendation. On the other hand, if in order to understand what is written, piously and worthily of God, we have no alternative but to believe the statements presented to us, in a figurative and enigmatical sense; then, as we possess Apostolic authority by which so many enigmas of the Old Testament have been solved, let us keep to the method we have set before us; that by the assistance of Him who has exhorted us to ask, to seek, and to knock, we may be enabled to explain all those figures of things in accordance with the Catholic faith, whether pertaining to history or prophecy: and this without prejudice to any better and more careful explanation, whether by ourself, or by any others to whom the Lord may vouchsafe to reveal it."

It may be asked, then, what is the method adopted in our ensuing remarks? We answer, It is one which most resembles the third, or the one adopted by St Augustine. We interpret the narrative neither exclusively in a physical sense; nor, like Origen, exclusively in a spiritual sense; nor yet altogether like Augustine, who shifts the interpretation sometimes from one to the other. Swedenborg maintains, that there was really an earthly territory answering Eden and Paradise; rivers bounding that territory and human beings living in it and constituting the Church. The narrative, therefore, is based upon historical fact; but its object is not to furnish a history of external historical facts, but of internal spiritual facts; in other words, the spiritual history of the Church at that time. None but an inspired person could ever attempt such a thing with regard to the Church; for the true nature of the interior of the mind is that which, of himself, no human

could possibly know. Nevertheless, they are described to us in the Sacred Record, in order that we might know what the state of Adam primevally was, and so might judge of our present condition by comparing it with that of the primeval race in Paradise.

This knowledge is the more important, because, as Locke says :\*—"It is obvious to any one who reads the New Testament, that the doctrine of redemption, and consequently of the Gospel, is founded upon the supposition of Adam's *fall*. To understand therefore what we are restored to by Jesus Christ, we must consider what the Scriptures shew we lost by Adam." To this end, it will be requisite to consider what Adam himself lost: thus what was signified by his being inspired with the breath of lives; by his being placed in Paradise; by his eating of the tree of lives, and giving names to every living creature.

This inquiry is the more needed because of the tendencies of modern Theology.

"The new enquiries respecting the Antiquity of Man," says a modern writer,† "make some people tremble lest the story of Adam in Paradise should be shaken. My own anticipations from those enquiries are altogether hopeful. I know not in what they may issue. But while I have a strong conviction that whatever way the facts go, they will make that simple story more simple and more intelligible to us, and will strip it of a thousand wilful additions, I have a still stronger conviction, that we shall never really regard the Second Adam as Him by whom all things were created, and

\* *Reasonableness of Christianity*, p. 1.

† *Claims of the Bible and of Science*, p. 116. By the Rev. F. D. Maurice.

by whom all things consist—as the true Man, the actual image of the invisible God—till the first Adam occupies quite a different place in our divinity from that which he has occupied for several centuries.”

After mentioning that the Old Testament speaks of the first Adam only once after his expulsion from Eden, and the New Testament only twice, it is added:—

“Turn to any book of systematic divinity, and you would suppose Adam’s FALL was the subject of the Bible, the very ground of Law and Gospel. Surely such a divinity needs reformation. Thanks to the physical student, if, in anywise he helps the Reformation forward.”

Another distinguished disciple of the same school of theology observes; \*—

“All that we read of Adam and Eve in the Bible is, as we should expect, the history of *children*,—children in mind even when they were full grown in stature. Innocent as children, but like children, greedy, fanciful, ready to disobey at the first temptation, for the very silliest of reasons; and disobeying accordingly.”

Our primeval ancestors are therefore described as weak, wilful, and ignorant, unable to take care of themselves, liable to be destroyed off the face of the earth, by their own folly, or even by the wild beasts around.

Such is the state attributed to our first parents in Paradise; but which belongs rather to our first parents *out* of Paradise; since it answers, for the most

\* *The Gospel of the Pentateuch*, p. 38. By the Rev. C. Kingsley, F.L.S., F.G.S., etc.

part, to the state of Chaos out of which man was brought by those processes of creation and formation which constituted the six days' work of God.

If the state of our primeval ancestors in Paradise were such only as above described, it is obvious that they must have lost very little by the Fall; and for this simple reason, that they had not much to lose. In this case, undoubtedly the doctrine of the Fall would be comparatively of little importance; the position which it would occupy in any system of Theology which would give it eminence, would be altogether a false one: and such a Theology would indeed require a reformation.

It is remarkable that the primeval history of man, as given by Swedenborg, comprises both the theory concerning the inferior origin of man, and the doctrine concerning his exalted condition in Paradise. In this point of view Science and Theology are not at variance with each other: the two are not inconsistent; and if they have been regarded as mutually antagonistic, it has been from the want of a principle of interpretation, which should be enabled to reconcile the one to the other.



.

## INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION.

---

### GENESIS—CHAPTER II.

1. “*Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.*”

In the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth, they existed in the human mind only\* *potentially*. It is as distinguished from this at first *potential* existence, that it is now said the heavens and earth were finished. It was only on the second day that, by means of light, the one came to be eliminated from the other, and each was perceived to have a distinct existence. “I assert,”† says an eminent writer, “that the primary law of our being is not *confusion*, but *distinction*; that difference must precede resemblance, harmony be formed out of discord, plurality exist before unity;”—before that time the heavens and earth were in the chaotic state, confounded and commingled with each other. In the *chaotic* state, the perceptions of the mind, whether sensuous, rational, or moral, are obscure, confused, and indis-

\* Glasæ's *Philologia Sacra*, p. 2138.

† *Christian Morals*, by the Rev. W. Sewell, M.A., Fellow and Tutor Exeter College, and Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University Oxford; p. 104, 106.

tinct. With regard to the *senses*, it is only by practice that the infant learns to perceive more and more distinctly the differences between objects. At first even the difference between the material heavens and earth is unperceived; the perception of forms and colors is but faint and obscure, and the idea of distance, hence of height and of depth, has yet to be created. The infant mind, therefore, is at first in a state of *chaos* even as to the senses. Hence Professor Butler\* speaks of that "primitive *chaos* of the mind" in which, uninformed of distance or figure, the eye conveys to the conscious being only a vague impression of color.

The want of perception therefore of the difference and distinction between objects, is the *Chaos* of the sensuous mind. After these objects, however, are perceived to be different and distinct, they must be *ordinated* or *classified*. If not, they exist, in relation to the mind, only in a state of disorder; and this disorderly state is the *Chaos* of *reason*, for it is reason only which classifies. Now this classification is the office of the Sciences.

"Reason," it is well said,† "is the knowledge of differences—the perception of relation between objects which, however similar, are not the same. It is a work of classification, in which an infinite variety of separate facts are not confounded together, but held distinctly, and yet conjointly, under one head, by an act of the mind. Let them cease to be separate facts, and the whole work of reason is superseded. And so with *moral* feelings and affections, as well as *moral* actions."

\* *Lectures on Ancient Philosophy*, vol. i., p. 122.

† Sewell's *Christian Morals*, p. 106.

Botany, geometry, mathematics, astronomy, zoology, and so forth, relate to the material universe. In\* each of these departments, Nature has thrown before the eye of man a vast seeming *Chaos* of separate facts. All the variety of the animal world before the zoologist—the infinite multitude of plants before the botanist—the confused stratification of rocks, with their innumerable fossils, before the geologist—the complicated motions of the planets, and seeming *Chaos* of the starry heavens, before the astronomer. Now, what is the work of the intellect when placed before this multitudinous assemblage of facts? It is to do that which the Spirit of God did for the *Chaos* recorded in Genesis, and which the same Spirit in the Word of God, the Logos, does for the wild, turbulent, distracted *Chaos* of human ideas—reduce them into order.

"A Geologist† travels over England. He sees chalk and gravel, clay and granite, limestone and coal formations, huddled as it were together. He examines them, discovers that they occur in groups, in one regular uniform order; in other words, traces out the form or figure of their arrangements; and Geology becomes a science. So to the ignorant boy language is a *chaos* of words. The scholar discerns the *forms* of it, the laws by which it is inflected, the rules to be observed in the arrangement of letters and syllables, words and sentences; and grammar becomes a science. It is, to use the language of Plato, the whole business of man's intellect to discover the forms or *idéai*, or, as we usually say, the general laws of things."

Thus far we have described the origin of the *Mun-*

\* *Ibid.*, p. 310.

† *Ibid.*, p. 311.



*dus Sensibilis*, and partly the *Mundus Intelligibilis*, as existing in the mind of man. But as both the senses and the natural sciences relate to outward Nature, so they relate to material, mundane, or earthly things; and therefore constitute, as we shall see, the “*earth*” of the human mind, *i. e.*, the ground or basis out of which a still higher knowledge is to spring.

But if we have spoken of a *sensuous Chaos*, and an *intellectual Chaos*, what shall we say of a *moral Chaos*? Are there not those who, by reason of confounding immutable distinctions, call evil good and good evil, who put darkness for light and light for darkness, bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter? This is the *Chaos* of the *moral* senses: it may be the chaos of ignorance, hence of the mind in its infantine or uneducated state.

... “If\* we find the perfection of productive art all around us consists in the reduction into unity of various antagonistic, discordant elements—in politics bringing differing wills under one law, in *morals* uniting independent affections in one bond of love, in art constructing one plan out of different materials; if the human mind seems placed by nature before a multitude of objects thrown together as in a *Chaos*, and is commanded by nature, is even forced by it for self-preservation to arrange, systematize, regulate, conciliate, adjust, proportion them, that is, to reduce them into unity, and with their reduction into unity its work is completed, its perfection attained, its craving satisfied, its peace and satisfaction ensured,—may it not be that the whole of this progressive scheme of Creation, in the midst of which we find ourselves

\* *Christian Vestiges of Creation*, by W. Sewell, D.D., late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford; p. 47.

working, may be a process of the same kind ; a slow, gradual, successive reduction into unity of opposing and contradictory elements ; an evolution of peace out of war, of order out of *Chaos*, of goodness out of a conflict of evil, of one perfect harmony out of collision and discord ? May not the existence of discord, of collisions, of contradictions, of disorder, of evil, of plurality, in one word (and the profoundest philosophy has always identified plurality with evil and unity with good), may not the existence of this plurality be an essential condition for the final triumph of good, that is, of the good, the beautiful, the true, the great ? Can we be surprised to hear of a Creation groaning and travailing together, as a woman in travail, looking with an earnest expectation for the development of a *new heaven* and a *new earth*, of a kingdom of peace and righteousness, in which all things shall be brought together in one, with one Spirit pervading one vast body composed of many members, and that body one with God, and God with it, one yet not the same ?"

What this *new heaven* and *new earth* are, as eliminated out of an antecedent *Chaos*, we shall soon explain. In the meantime we observe, that there is a still more disorderly *Chaos*, arising out of an evil or perverted state of society. Thus Gregory the Great :\*—

"The enemy palliates himself with such arts, that he feigns our faults to be virtues, so that a man expects eternal rewards where he is worthy only of eternal punishment. Thus cruelty, in being avenged upon vice, is thought justice ; the immoderate anger of just zeal, merit ; extravagance is bountifulness ; parsimony is frugality ; obstinacy is constancy. And, as Maximus hath it, swearing is counted a grace to one's speech ; the angry are called courageous ; darkness light, and

\* See Mayer on *Isaiah*, chap. v. 20.

sour sweet; i. e., the darkness of error is the light of wisdom; and sour heresies are sweet truths," etc.

So also flattery is regarded as sincere friendship; the rebuke of vice as personal hostility; poverty of spirit as incapacity and cowardice; meekness as meanness; not to speak of endless other *confusions*.

A proper distinction between good and evil, between light and darkness, is therefore essential to the formation of a *heaven* within the mind; and thus *heaven* and *earth*, as comprehending the heavenly and the earthly, *the spiritual and the natural*, comprehend the whole mind of man; and the quality of his spiritual and natural principles constitutes the quality of his *heaven* and *earth*.—"Man is a little world," says a Commentary,\* "consisting of *heaven* and *earth*, soul and body: now here (Gen. ii. 7) we have an account of the original of both, and the putting of both together." So another Commentary†—"Man was to be a creature different from all that had been hitherto made. Flesh and spirit, *heaven* and *earth* must be put together in him, and he must be allied to both worlds."—It is in the same sense, as we shall see, that the expression *heaven* and *earth* is used by the prophets all through the Bible. Many heathen philosophers contemplated the mind according to this distinction; and therefore what the Scriptures called the kingdom of *heaven* in man, these philosophers called the *Mundus Intelligibilis*, and what the Scriptures called the *earth*, they called the *Mundus Sensibilis*.

\* *Commentary* of Matthew Henry, Gen. i. 27; 2, 7.

† *Commentary* of the Tract Society, *in loc.*

Now the natural, moral, and spiritual qualities of the mind are not the same in one age as in those of another; hence the *heaven* and *earth* of one age are not the same with those of another. There have been consequently various *heavens* and *earths* proper to various Dispensations. There was one *heaven* and *earth* of the Adamic Dispensation; another of the Noachic; another of the Mosaic; another of the Christian; and another is expected which is to be final. Thus as one *heaven* and *earth* passes away, it is succeeded by another. This is especially evident in Isaiah and the Apocalypse: "Behold I create *new heavens* and a *new earth*, and the *former* shall not be remembered, nor come into mind." That the meaning of this passage is such as we have assigned to it, there is no doubt in the Church. Thus one Commentator\* observes:—"This creation of new *heavens* and *earth* began at the time when the Gospel of Christ began its progress; and is to be completed at that other time when it shall please God the Creator to render it perfect, in the consummation of all things." Another† observes—"In the grace and comfort believers have in and from Christ, we are to look for this new *heaven* and new *earth*. The Divine Power is inexhaustible; the same God that created one *heaven* and *earth*, can create another. The circumstances of the Church, and the character of men, shall be so altered, that it will appear entirely as a *new world*. Former confusions, iniquities, and miseries of the human race, shall

\* *Family Bible*, Isaiah lxx. 17.

† *Tract Society* on Isaiah lxx. 17.

be no more remembered or renewed.”—Another Commentator\* observes:—“At the birth of the Saviour and the preaching of the Apostles, were beheld a new *heaven* and a new *earth*, in the happy change which came upon the whole universe. The Gentiles, who for so long a time had been in the profound darkness of corruption, ignorance, and death, began to open their eyes to the light of the Gospel. The *earth*, plunged into disorder, idolatry, delivered over to the power of hell and the empire of sin, not only barren of good works, but miserably fertile in all sorts of crimes: this *earth*, at the preaching of the Gospel, changed its face, and became bright, emancipated, purified, and fruitful.”

There are yet other passages in the prophet *Isaiah*: Thou “forgettest Jehovah thy Maker, that hath stretched forth the *heavens*, and layeth the foundations of the *earth*.” . . . “I have put my words in thy mouth, and I have covered thee with the shadow of my hand, that I may plant the *heavens*, and lay the foundation of the *earth*.” . . . That *heaven* and *earth* are here predicated of *man* is generally admitted: signifying, as A Lapidet observes,—“That thou mayest create and establish a *new spiritual world*, viz., the Church and kingdom of God, in which the faithful may lead a celestial life, and be firmly consolidated, and established as the earth, in faith, hope and charity. So Jerome, Haymo, Forerius, Dionysius, and others.” Moreover Mayer† upon this passage, following Augustine, observes—“The Evangelical *Church* is often

\* *Calmet* on *Isaiah*, lxxv. 17.

† *Isaiah* li. 16.

‡ *Mayer* on *Isaiah* li. 15.

called the kingdom of *heaven* ; and in respect of this that we have souls from heaven and bodies from the earth, *we* may be called both *heaven* and *earth*. Therefore purge out the *earth*, that is, earthly affections, from thy heart, and thou shalt be *heaven* ; thou bearest flesh indeed and so art *earth*, but in thy heart thou art *heaven*." Again : " God dwells in heaven, and He dwells in all the righteous and holy. Therefore the Apostles, though they were in the earth, were *heaven* : and God sitting in them walked all over the world."

The creation of new *heavens* and *earths*, therefore, indicates a new state of the human mind, hence a new state of religion, and consequently of the Church. Thus, when man is created anew, the *heavens* and *earth* are created anew ; and when the *heavens* and the *earth* are created anew, so is man. Hence Isaiah and Paul were both referring to the same things when the one said,\*—" Behold I create new *heavens* and a new *earth* ;" and the other,† " Put ye on the new *man*, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."‡—" Ye have put off the old *man* with his deeds, and have put on the new *man*, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." That the Apostle is here referring to the first and second chapters of Genesis is generally admitted ; the creation of *man*, and the creation of *heaven* and *earth* being identical with each other. Hence the Apostle alludes to the prophecy of Haggai§ concerning *heaven* and *earth*,

\* Isaiah lrv. 17.      † Ephesians iv. 24.      ‡ Col. iii. 9, 10.

§ Haggai ii. 6 ; Heb. xii. 26.

as signifying a change in the *civil and ecclesiastical* state of the Jews, and again another change which awaits the present Christian Church. "Yet once more I shake not the *earth* only, but also *heaven*;" denoting, as Bishop Horsley\* on *Isaiah* observes, "those great changes for the better in ecclesiastical and civil politics, in religion and morals, which are to take place in the very last period of the Church upon earth." This last period is thus referred to in the Apocalypse :†—"I saw a new *heaven* and a new *earth*, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away;" and, accordingly, both in Genesis and the Apocalypse, the creation of the heaven and the earth is followed by a description of *Paradise*.

Now if the *heaven* and *earth* be thus of a spiritual nature and have relation to the human mind, so must the *Garden of Eden*; and if the Garden, then all its *plants, rivers, trees, and animals*. And if, as modern Science has shewn, the whole visible creation has reference to MAN, so likewise, as we have already shewn, has the invisible creation. Consequently, if even in a natural sense gardens, plants, rivers, trees and animals have a relation to MAN, so also have they in a spiritual sense; the one having a correspondence with the body, the other with the mind.

The *earth*, or the external form of the religion of the Jews, consisted generally in the observance of outward rites and ceremonies, and, when these were changed, their external or civil state was changed. In the present day the external of the human mind is not formed in this manner. The Jews knew no-

\* *Biblical Criticism*, vol. i., p. 145.

† Chap. xxi. 1.

thing of the Sciences ; but the Sciences have created a new world, namely, what is commonly called the scientific world, and this corresponds to a *new earth*, being a new formation of the external mind of man. The creation of a *new earth* implies the creation of a *new heaven*, or a new state of religion. A *new earth* without a *new heaven* would lead to positive infidelity ; for, as already observed, since all the controlling forces of Nature are in the visible heavens, so the forces controlling the external mind must proceed from the heavens in the internal mind, or otherwise the external mind is under no inward and controlling power whatever. Therefore there must be a new heaven corresponding to the new earth. At present the correspondence does not exist ; for the old heavens do not correspond with the new earth ; the old state of Theology, with the new state of Science.

If indeed, as affirmed by some, the beginning of all things and the end of all things are equally beyond comprehension, are the intermediates between the beginning and the end equally so ? This, we believe, will not be asserted. What then are the intermediates between the heaven and earth at the beginning, and the heaven and earth at the ending, of all things ? In two cases, namely those of the Mosaic and those of the Christian Dispensation, we have positive knowledge of what they are. Thus in the *only* cases in which they have come within reach of comprehension, they have been of a moral, or allegorical nature. Therefore, if in a *series* of heavens and earths the two intermediates are known to be of an allegorical nature, it is but reasonable to presume that those of



the beginning and ending of all things are of the same description.

Suppose, however, that we interpreted the narrative in Genesis only in the literal sense, it would still be true that the literal heavens and earth, the garden, plants, rivers, trees, and animals would all have a reference to MAN, as modern Science has shewn; and all would still point to some hidden spiritual truths, as maintained by the ancient philosophy: the only difference would be, that while it was indicated by Nature, we as Christians would be unable to interpret the hieroglyphics of Nature.—But—

Not only were the heavens and earth finished, but "*all the host of them.*" The term *host* is correlative to the expression *without form and void*; for *host* signifies an organized multitude, and hence by some is rendered in Latin *exercitus*. The Septuagint renders it by the term *Cosmos*, the chaos having now become a Cosmos. The angels are called the *heavenly host* in relation to their number and perfect order and arrangement: the twelve tribes of Israel in military order were also called *hosts* upon the same principle, and, as in the Apocalypse, represented those of heaven.

In *Psaln* cxlviii. all the *hosts* are called upon to praise the Lord:—"Praise ye the Lord from the heavens: praise him in the heights. Praise ye him all his angels: praise ye him all *his hosts.*" To praise the Lord in the heavens and the heights, is to praise Him in a state of elevated affections and thoughts. If we regard the term *hosts* as including all things animate and inanimate, in this case when

it is said, "Praise the Lord from the *earth*, ye dragons and all deeps: fire and hail, snow and vapor, stormy wind fulfilling his word: mountains and all hills, fruitful trees and all cedars: beasts and all cattle, creeping things and flying fowl."—How are we to call upon *these* to praise the Lord? In answer to this we are told, that "every work of God's hand partakes so much of his perfections, that it requires only to be studied and known, in order to shew forth the manifold wisdom, power and goodness of the Creator." This indeed is true, but is not the whole truth. For independently of all this,\* "he who cannot trace one grand and deep system of Analogy running through the whole Creation from the top to the bottom, is wholly incapable of comprehending it. He is unfit to look upon it. Until once more we are taught to read the book of the world in this way, it will remain to us a sealed volume."

"For," says the *Wisdom of Solomon*,† "by the greatness and beauty of the creatures, *proportionably* the Maker of them is seen." "The word† *proportionably* is in the Septuagint rendered ἀναλόγως *analogically* or by *analogy*. And so did Chrysostom, Cyril, and Gregory in his *Morals* interpret the passage; so that the sense is: From the greatness and the appearance, that is, the beauty of things created, God himself, who is their Author and Maker, may be known by *analogy* or *analogically*, by a certain kind of mutual comparison between them, which is done in the manner above mentioned,

\* Sewell's *Christian Morals*, p. 326.

† Chap. xiii. 5.

‡ *Biblia Maxima* of De La Haye, *in loc.*

namely, by comparing the effect with the efficient cause." This is also the interpretation of Menochius, Arnauld, etc. Indeed De la Haye observes, that "all the various renderings of this passage agree in this sense, that the Creator may be known from the creatures by *analogy*, namely, by arguing from the effect to the cause."

This is the identical doctrine of Swedenborg,\* who says—That "natural things represent spiritual, and that they correspond together, may also be known from this consideration, that what is natural cannot possibly have existence except from a cause prior to itself. This cause is of spiritual origin, and there is nothing natural which does not thence derive the cause of its existence. Natural forms are effects, nor can they exist as causes, still less as causes of causes . . . all natural things represent the things appertaining to the spiritual to which they correspond," etc.

It is then this doctrine of Analogy or Correspondence which is thus plainly taught in the *Wisdom of Solomon*; and this is the meaning of the ancient saying of Trismegistus,†—"Universum liber est divinitatis, et seculum hoc sublustre speculum divinatorum."

"It is the constant opinion of all the Fathers," says De La Haye,‡ "that many truths are divinely signified to us by things; since this is no inferior mode of expression, but is very significant, and exceedingly profound. For it well became the majestic character of Divine language, not to

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 2991.

† *Psalmorum Davidicorum Analysis*, by Le Blanc; Psalm cxlviii., tom. vi., p. 1629.

‡ *Biblia Maxima*, Prolegomena, p. 12.

confine itself to one mode of speaking only, but to be open to many methods of signification, so as to express itself not only by *words* but by *things*. Hence it would not be foreign to the truth if we said, that the Divine teaching of Holy Scripture began not merely when it was first committed to writing, but long before, when the Most High provided earthly *things* for the purpose of instructing us and signifying very sublime mysteries. For not only by the history of the Patriarchs and the marvellous events of the world, but also by *the very characters of Nature* he began to instruct the human race. Hence not inaptly did some persons call Nature, or the Universe consisting of diversified natures, the first Scripture of God: *Prima Dei Scriptura ipsa Natura est*. Hence Basil says, 'The whole extent of the world is a book printed over with letters.' And Chrysostom:—"All these things were ordained by God from the beginning, to impress the mind of the spectator, and excite his rational and intellectual powers to inquire after and adore the Artist and most surpassing Artificer, who so made these things that the whole body of Creation might serve for so many books and alphabets. Wherefore David also said, 'The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament sheweth his handiwork. There is neither speech nor language where their voices are not heard.'"

"Both the Sacred Oracles, therefore, and the Fathers agree, that the various genera of *things*, both in heaven and earth, are so many spoken words, characters, or writings, making known the Divine majesty; so that the antiquity of the Sacred Oracles is not less than that of the nature of things, since the language of God originated with the Creation of the world.

... "By the Tabernacle of the Covenant and the Ark of the Testimony are signified things which God has shadowed forth in Nature, and which he finally declared in the New

Testament; so that the ordination of Nature, and the artificial structure of the Tabernacle respond to each other with wonderful harmony; both agreeing with the writings of the New Testament which further develop the mysteries of God."

Accordingly Swedenborg, referring to the Hundred and Forty-Eighth Psalm, observes,\* "In this Psalm the things which shall praise Jehovah are enumerated by various things which are without life in the world; as *fire, hail, snow, vapor, stormy wind, mountains, hills, trees, fruits, cedars*: likewise by *beasts, cattle, creeping things and birds*, which things themselves cannot praise Jehovah. Who cannot see, therefore, that to recount such things in the Divine Word would be vain and superfluous, unless they were significative of *such things in man as can praise*, that is, can worship, Jehovah. From the Science of Correspondences it is known, that *whales* signify the scientifics of the natural man in general; *abysses*, or *deeps* and *seas*, the natural principle itself where scientifics are; *beasts and cattle*, the affections of the natural man, both of his understanding and of his will; *creeping things*, the sensual principle, which is the ultimate of the natural man; and *winged birds*, the cogitative principle thence derived."

2. "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made."

3. "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made."

\* *Apoc. Ex.*, art. 650.

What is the work which God created and made, and from which he rested?—

We have seen that MAN was the Final Cause of Creation; that the Heaven and Earth were the heaven and earth of the human mind; that the Chaos was the Chaos of the human mind; that the Cosmos was that of the human mind; and the six days' work, the several processes by which man was brought out of Chaos into the Cosmos, or into Paradise. These processes had now terminated, and man had reached the sabbatical state: viz., that which is represented by *Paradise*.

The nature of the *rest*, then, which is implied in the words, “God *rested* from his work,” must be derived from the nature of the *work* from which He is said to have *rested*. The nature of this work we have already explained; viz., the bringing of man out of the Chaotic or sensuous state, into the sabbatical.

“Our\* weakness lies in the sensitive soul, the immediate seat of all our passions and affections; which, as it results from the conjunction of the pure spirit and body, is solicited on both sides, and must incline to one or the other. If it join with the spirit, it will itself become spiritualized in all its tendencies; but as it more or less inclines to the flesh, so far it becomes carnal and degenerate. Now because all the motions and affections of this inferior soul are more immediately conversant with the objects of our bodily appetites, and more constantly importuned by their constant and intimate presence, they are in their own nature apt to close with these and dwell upon them. And it is not without

\* Bishop Browne *On the Procedure, etc., of Human Understanding* p. 380.

great difficulty and resolution that they can be weaned and drawn off from them, so as to be chiefly employed upon the invisible things of another world, and such things here as have a more immediate relation to them. For this reason, both the inferior soul and body go under the denomination of *flesh*; and accordingly of this it is said, that 'the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other.'

"These are the two enemies which must engage: implacable, irreconcilable enemies ever since the Fall; and the short fierce *combat* is for Eternity. The secret influences of the Holy Spirit of God come into the assistance of the purely spiritual part of us. The Devil on the other side is a constant auxiliary to the flesh; the *struggle* is for no less than life or death everlasting; and the one or the other must obtain a complete victory."

Everlasting life is everlasting *rest*: it is the rest signified by the seventh day, or the Sabbath. Is it rest only future, or is it present? The Apostle says, "We which have believed *do* enter into rest." Vulgate says, "We that believe *shall* enter into rest" herein departing from the original Greek which is in the present tense. "We† do not deny," says Commentator, "that in this passage may be signified an entrance already prepared, and in a measure commenced. This preparation and commencement effected by faith."

Accordingly another Commentator‡ interprets the passage thus:—

"The great spiritual blessings, the forerunner

\* Hebrews, chap. iv. 3.

† Estlin

‡ Adam Clarke, *in loc.*

glory, which were all typified by that earthly *rest* or felicity promised to the ancient Israelites, we Christians *do*, by believing in Christ Jesus, *actually possess*. We have peace of conscience and joy in the Holy Ghost; are saved from the guilt and power of sin, and thus enjoy an *inward rest*."

"The Holy Scriptures," says another Commentator,\* "do not speak only of one *rest*. But as there was a rest of the seventh day therein mentioned, so there was a *rest* in the promised land; and from that which is said touching it, we may rightly infer that there is a third *rest* which is *the rest and tranquillity of the soul*, entered upon by faith justifying us, and procuring unto us peace with God, which shall be perfected hereafter in heaven. And this *rest*, both that of the seventh day, and in Canaan, may well be counted types and figures."

"True rest,"† says Gregory, "is that of truth and virtue, when compared with the *labors* of men in the ways of error and vice. There is no peace saith my God to the wicked. The soul finds no rest in error and in vice. *Rest* therefore pertains to the good; the wicked have no rest."

So also Augustin :‡—

"God is said to *rest*, inasmuch as he causes others to rest. For when we work He works in us, and when we rest He rests in us. Or, the rest of God signifies the rest of those who rest in God, etc. God is, moreover, said to have rested, as having ordained that the order of those things which he had made should be preserved *for all future time without infringement*; and having caused every creature to have ceased from the old state of *confusion*."

\* Mayer, *in loc*.

† *Sylva Sylvarum* of Lauretus, art. *Requies*.

‡ *Ibid*. See also *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xi., cap. viii.



This explains the meaning of the Apostle:—  
“There remaineth therefore a *rest* to the people of God. For he that is entered into his *rest*, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his. Let us labor then to enter into that *rest*.”

There is the *labor* or drudgery arising from being the slave of sin. “Come unto me all ye that *labor* and are heavy laden, and ye shall find *rest* to your souls.” There is the *labor* or work which consists in struggling against sin. This is the labor meant by the Apostle when he says, “Let us *labor* to enter into that *rest*.” When that rest is attained, the work in this respect is finished. Man rests in God, and God rests in man; for before, God and man were both said to work.† “*Work* out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is *God* that *worketh* in both to will and to do.” Therefore in this sabbatical state as the *work* was before attributed to God, so is now the *rest*.

Accordingly, when the Apostle says, “Let us *labor*, therefore, to enter into that *rest*,”—a Commentator‡ observes, that “these things signified that faithful and Christian people would, in like manner, rest in heaven in the eternal rest of God; and would, in much greater felicity, repose from all the toilsome and arduous *labors* to become virtuous; and from all the *laboring* and *struggling* against vice and temptation, and from all self-mortification whether active or passive, under which persons are suffering, and with which they are afflicted in this life.”

\* *Heb.* iv. 10.

† *Phil.* ii. 12.

‡ A Lapide, *Heb.* iv. 10.

"There," says Chrysostom, "is *rest* indeed, where grief and sorrow and sighing flee away, and where there are no more cares, *labors*, or *strugglings*." So in the Apocalypse, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth. Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may *rest* from their *labors*"—that is, says a Commentator,\* . . . "from all outward sorrows and calamities in this life men *labor* under and are wearied with in this life; and from all inward troubles, from a body of sin, from the temptations of Satan, and from all doubts and fears, from their present warfare state, and all conflicts with their spiritual enemies." Thus the Church is *militant* here upon earth, wrestling not only against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, until it enters into its *rest* in heaven.

But what ground have we for this sense of the terms *labor* and *rest* in the present case? As to the term *rest*, Bishop Horsley† well observes that "Peace is a thing of *order* and *arrangement*. But evil consists in the want of *order* and *arrangement*, and in the want of a direction of everything to its proper end. Of this the God of *good* and *order* is indeed the Creator," etc.

We have seen that the narrative of the first chapter relates to the passage of man from out of *Chaos* into *Paradise*, out of disorder into order, out of conflict into harmony. The work of God, therefore, signifies those Divine operations by which man has been brought out of *unrest* into *rest*, out of the six days

\* *Biblical Criticism*, vol. i., page 32.

† Gill *in loc.*

into the seventh, out of his state by nature into his angelic state. In all these cases, indeed, man himself was a laborer and a worker; but it is called the work of God, in the same sense as faith on the part of man is so called when it is said, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." The work of God, then, does not exclude the work of man, but presupposes it; for God first worketh in man to will and to do, and then man worketh out his own salvation. Were the case otherwise, how could Adam himself have rested on the seventh day? He would have done nothing from which to rest. For *labor* and *rest* are correlative terms. If Adam rested on the seventh day as well as his Creator, it must have been for the reason that before that time there was a state of *labor*, or of *work*: otherwise Adam would have rested from nothing.

"Now the fact is obvious," says a modern writer,\* "that the world is intended to create or develope works combined and harmonized out of opposite principles, and that this creation and development is to be a work of time."—There is a *chaos* now in the world; all the processes of Creation mentioned in Genesis, are at this very day being carried on by the Creator, and the laws by which God effects his purposes are no other than those of his Divine Providence. The entire history of the Bible is the history of man in these several stages either of creation or of chaos, of order or disorder, of life or of death.

There are, as we have seen, three essentials of the Divine Being; Love, Wisdom, and Power, corres-

\* Sewell's *Vestiges of Creation*, page 24.

ponding to the three distinctions of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In this Trinity in Unity there is a subordination, according to which the Father is first in order, the Son is second, the Holy Spirit is third; and the order of the distinctions is as important as the distinctions themselves. To place wisdom or truth before love is to place the Son before the Father; and to place sovereign Power before Love or Wisdom, is to place the Holy Spirit before the Father and the Son. Moreover, to place truth before love is to place faith before charity; and this is a disturbance of Divine Order; the new creation of man not being completed till the greatest of all virtues is seen to be charity. In this case, from being an image and likeness of God, man becomes a likeness and image of God; likeness having a relation to love, and image to faith. Until that consummation, man is in a state of *labor*; when that consummation arrives, he is in a state of *rest*, and this is the state described in the present chapter. For as the seventh day has relation to the mind of man, so have the six days *labor*; so that the whole seven days have relation to man, or to distinct states of the human mind: and these distinct states are classed under two heads, viz., those of *labor* and *rest*.

The expressions, then, that God ended his work which he had made, and rested on the seventh day, are not puerile,—suited only to a childish and ignorant people; they are full of deep spiritual meaning, and imply a state of spiritual wisdom and experience far beyond that to which the most exalted Christian at present attains.

4. "*These are the nativities of the heavens and of the earth when he created them, in the day that Jehovah God made the earth and the heavens.*"

Mention is made in the Word of creating, forming, and making; also of the Divine Being as Creator, Former, and Maker. There is always observed, says Swedenborg,\* a nice distinction between these several terms. By *creating*† is signified what is new, or which was not before; by *forming* is signified quality, and by *making* effect. Thus in Isaiah,‡ "I have *created* him for my glory, I have *formed* him; yea, I have *made* him." Accordingly, to *create* the heavens and the earth is to cause them to be: to *form* them is to bring them into order; to *make* them is to perfect or complete the order. Hence, man is *made*, i.e., *perfected* when he becomes the celestial man.

So again in Isaiah:§ "I *form* the light, and *create* darkness: I *make* peace and *create* evil: I the Lord do all these things." I am the source of intelligence and of its genuine form and quality; I have caused the existence of darkness or ignorance as the plane upon which the light of intelligence is made to shine. I effect harmony in the mind out of those contending passions of the animal man. I cause *malum pænæ*, but not *malum culpæ*.

We may now see what ground there is for the following interpretations of Swedenborg:||—

"*In the beginning God created the heavens and*

\* *Arcana Cælestia*, art. 88.

† Art. 10,373.

‡ Chap. xliii. 7.

§ Chap. xlv. 7. See our *Appendix*.

|| *Apocalypse Explained*, vol. I., art. 294.

*the earth,*' etc. This narrative treats of the establishment of the first Church on this earth. The reformation of the members of that Church, as to their internal and as to their external state, is understood by the creation of the *heaven* and the *earth*. That there was no Church before, because men were without good and without truth, is signified by the earth being void and empty; and that they were then in dense ignorance, and also in falsities, is signified by the darkness upon the faces of the deep. Their first illumination is signified by the Spirit of God moving upon the faces of the waters, and God saying, 'Let there be light: and there was light.' By *the Spirit of God* is signified Divine truth proceeding from the Lord; and by *moving itself upon the faces of the waters* is signified illustration: a similar thing is signified by *light*; by *there was light* is signified the reception of Divine truth. That God created man in his own image, signifies that he was in the love of good and truth, and corresponded to heaven and its likeness; for the love of good and truth is an image of God, and hence also the Angelic heaven is an image of God, wherefore in the sight of the Lord it is as one man. That God created them male and female, signifies that he reformed them as to truth and as to good; *male* in the Word denotes *truth*, and *female* denotes *good*.

"From these considerations it is evident, that it is not the creation of (the material) heaven and earth, but the new creation or reformation of those who composed the first Church, which is described in the first and following chapters of Genesis; and that

similar things are there understood by the creation of *heaven* and *earth*, as by the creation of the new heaven and the new earth."

Thus:—

"Behold, I create a *new heaven* and a *new earth*, and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind. Be ye glad and exult for ever in that which I create; for behold I create Jerusalem exultation, and her people gladness;—*Jerusalem* denoting the Church, *exultation* its delight from good, and *gladness* its delight from truth."

5. "*And no shrub of the field was yet on the earth, and no herb of the field was as yet put forth, because Jehovah God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground.*"\*

Musculus remarks, that in this verse there is expressed a distinction between the herbage brought forth in the first chapter, and that which is here mentioned in the second. For in the first chapter, the herbage grows by the command of God, before the creation of man; in the second, the herbage is produced not merely by the command of God, but by the secondary causes of rain and tillage. There was as yet no herbage arising from rain, and from tillage by man, after he had arrived at the sabbatical state. This was the opinion also of some of the Hebrews, and therefore they say that not all plants and herbs are here meant, but only such as grow in grounds husbanded by the art of man; and that they are expressly called *plants of the field* תבואה, signifying a field

\* See our *Appendix*.

manured, and not plants of *קֶמֶח*, signifying the earth in general.

A similar observation is made by other Commentators :\*—

“In this passage there are three words demanding our attention, and none of which are extant in the first chapter : *קֶמֶח* or *multitudo virgarum*, growing up from the root : *קֶמֶח* *ager cultus*, and *קֶמֶח* *germinare et pullulare*, viz., from the seed and the root. There is no such in the creation preceding. *קֶמֶח* is a cultivated part of the earth consisting of arable and pasture land, plants, etc. ; so that I here understand to be signified those fruit-trees, trees, and plants which, by culture and attention to ornament, give rise to delightful parks and gardens. For although on the third day God had replenished the earth with trees and plants, still the fields and gardens were not so delightful as now ; because as yet there was no rain, nor any man to till the ground. This sense of the passage wonderfully harmonizes with the sequel, where the formation of man and the plantation of Paradise is described.”

The distinctive meaning of the passage, however, is farther evident from a remark of Hilary,† who considers that it is the *external* man which is here treated of ;—

“Man, inasmuch as he contains within himself an *internal* and an *external* nature differing one from the other, and out of two kinds is made into one living being who is a partaker of reason, begins from a double origin. For first it is said, ‘Let us make man after our image and likeness ;’ and then, secondly, ‘That God took of the dust of the earth and formed man.’”

When, therefore, it is said that the Lord God

\* Ludov. De Dieu Bochart. See Poole's *Synopsis*.

† *Bened. Ed.*, p. 299.



breathed into him the breath of life, and man became a living soul—

“Man was prepared or formed with a view to this inspiration: by means of which the nature of the soul and of the body was, as by a bond of union between the two, held together in one perfect life. The blessed Paul knew that in himself there was a twofold nature, when he delighted in the law according to the *interior* man, and when he saw another law in his members (the *external* man) which led him captive to the law of sin. That, therefore, which is made after the image of God pertains to the dignity of the mind; but that which is formed of the earth is the original of the form and nature of the body.”

Both Tertullian\* and Augustin† take a similar view of the subject; so that when God said, “Let us make man in our image after our likeness,” reference is made to the *interior* man; and when it is said, “the Lord God made man out of the dust of the earth,” reference is made to the *exterior* man.

This passage, therefore, is not a recurrence to the narrative concerning the formation of man in the first chapter. The first narrative has relation to the *interior* man, the second to the *exterior*. Commentators in general have overlooked this distinction; Swedenborg has not. With Hilary, Tertullian, and Augustin, Swedenborg here considers the narrative to treat of the *exterior* man; but it is the exterior of man when arrived at the sabbatical state, called by Swedenborg the celestial man.

Augustin‡ observes that,

\* *De Resurrectione Carnis*, cap. v.

† *De Genesi contra Manichæos*, in loc.

‡ *Ibid.*, in loc.

"Even now God is making the *green thing* of the field; but this He does by *raining* upon the earth, that is, by his Word he causes souls to renew their verdure. It is, however, from *clouds* that he waters them, that is, from the Scriptures of the Prophets and Apostles. Rightly, therefore, are these denominated *clouds*; because their words which are resonant, and die away with the vibration of the air, when accompanied with the obscurity of allegories which enfolds them in a certain kind of darkness, become as it were *clouds*. So that when these words are expressed in a discourse, a *shower*, as it were, of truth is poured down into the minds of the intelligent." . . .

"I wish," says Augustin, "that from these clouds man would but receive this shower of truth willingly." Philo has a somewhat similar interpretation—"The truth is," says he, "that by the *green herb of the field* is meant that which is perceptible by the intellect only, the budding forth of the mind."

So in *Isaiah* :\* "Drop down, ye heavens, from above, and let the clouds pour down righteousness."

So in *Zechariah* :† "Ask ye of the Lord *rain* in the time of the latter *rain*; so the Lord shall make bright clouds, and give them *showers of rain*, to every one grass in the field." *i.e.*, "God shall give," says A Lapide, "*grass* unto all that ask Him, or the *germs of salvation* in their hearts; because He shall inspire them with pious thoughts, affections, impulses, desires, which, like germinations, shall bring forth abundance of good fruits and heroic works." . . . "Those clouds are gravid and bright which afford copious *showers of wisdom* and of the Spirit with which to irrigate

\* Chap. xlv. 8.

† Chap. x. 1. A Lapide *in loc.*

the parched hearts of men, in order that they may bring forth the germs and produce the fruits of virtue." So likewise Mayer, who says that by *rain* is set forth *heavenly doctrine*, or teaching from heaven. "As the *rain* cometh out of the clouds, so *doctrine* out of the Scriptures, out of which only the true men of God raise them."

So in *Ezekiel* :\* "And I will raise up for them a plant of renown, and they shall be no more consumed with hunger in the land."—"Christ by his doctrine and grace," says A Lapide, "as with a *shower*, raises up in the mind, that is, in the understanding and will, pious and holy germs, namely, the holy inspirations of virtues; so that being fed by these and strengthened, we may experience no hunger of the spirit, but may be nourished, and grow, and advance to the perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

So in *Hosea* :† "Sow to yourselves in righteousness, reap in mercy; break up your fallow ground; for it is time to seek the Lord, till he come and *rain* righteousness upon you;" where it is generally admitted that by *rain* is signified *doctrine*, or the teaching of Divine truth; according to Swedenborg the *influx of Divine Truth*, as in the Psalm,‡ where it is said, "Thou, O God, didst send a plentiful *rain* upon thine inheritance," etc. This rain, however, was not yet.

6. "*But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground.*"

"Before the introduction of sin," says St. Augustin,§

\* Chap. xxxiv. 29.

† Chap. x. 12.

‡ lxviii. 9.

§ *De Genesi contra Manichæos.*

"when God had made the green thing of the field and pasture, by which expression is signified, as we have already observed, the invisible creation, God watered this creation from an *interior* fountain, speaking into the intellect of man ; so that man received not words from without, descending upon him as rain from the clouds above mentioned ; but was satiated from his own fountain-head, that is, from truth flowing from his own inmost recesses."

The more strict interpretation of the words implies the ascent or exaltation of the truths of the natural mind, effected by the influx of Divine Love.

7. "*And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.*"

There had not been as yet a *man* to till the ground ; but there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground. The interpretation of *ground* in these passages requires a corresponding interpretation of *the dust of the ground*. If, therefore, the *ground* has relation to the mind of man, so has *dust of the ground*. The original seems to mean, that Jehovah God formed into *man* the *dust* of the ground, or, the dust of the ground into man. Thus Cajetan,—"*Et formavit Deus pulverem de terra hominem, i. e., in hominem.*" Now the Apostle says, "There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body." The natural body is the same with the animal body or animal man ; and consequently what is here signified is, that Jehovah God formed into *man* the very external or animal part of man ; and as the image and likeness of God is the interior man, so Jehovah God is here represented as forming into His

own likeness and image the very corporeal sensuous man: so that both externally and internally man becomes a likeness and image of God. Now this is done when all the senses, and hence all the imaginative region of the mind, are brought into correspondence with the regenerated will and intellect or interior man, so that they shall act and hence live from these, and not merely from without.

This passage, therefore, is no mere repetition or amplification of what had already been stated in ver. 27 of the former chapter. That chapter had reference to the intellectual and voluntary life of man as formed out of the animal man; the present chapter has reference to the animal man as formed out of the voluntary and intellectual life of man, and the inspiration of the interior life of both into that of the external man. The two processes, therefore, correspond, first, to the formation of principles, and, secondly, to the subordination of the external life to those principles.

Conformably to this interpretation the Psalmist says, "My soul cleaveth unto the *dust*," i.e., to sensuous and worldly things: "*quicken* thou me according to thy Word," i.e., *inspire* me with a new life which shall cause the sensuous things in me to live. Indeed that the *dust* signifies sensuous and worldly things is a common interpretation;\* and hence to "*cleave to the dust*" signifies a strong inclination to things sensuous and worldly: this *dust* the serpent eats. "The soul," we are told, "was not made of

\* As in Gregory the Great, *Lib. Mor.* on Job xl. 13. Also Scott, Gill, Matthew Henry on Psalm cxix. 25: Cruden.

the *earth* as the body was : it is a pity then that it should cleave to the earth and mind *earthly things*." Properly speaking, by *dust* is signified, says Swedenborg,\* "the corporeal sensual principle, which is understood by *walking upon the belly* and *eating dust*, as is everywhere said of the serpent." Hence in Amos ii. 7 reference is made to those "who pant after the *dust of the ground*," designating those who pant after earthly things.

When, therefore, it is said that God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life," the expression is of the same kind with "God said," "God saw," "God divided," which does not exclude the co-operation of man, but implies that man effected these things from God, so that it is God who effects them through the medium of man; and as man had now brought his very external life into conformity with the life of his regenerated will, and the life of his regenerated understanding, so this new state of man is represented by God breathing into the very external region of the mind the breath of lives, the life of the will and the life of the intellect; thus making the external man into a likeness and image of the internal. By the term *lives* in the plural number some understand the vegetative, sensitive, and rational life; some, the vegetative, sensitive, and angelic; or, the lives of plants, brutes, and angels; for, "Man† hath a vegetative life with trees and plants, a sensitive life with beasts, and above them both an intellectual or reasonable life with angels."

\* *Apocalypse Explained*, vol. iv., art. 632.

† *Assembly's Annotations*, in loc.: also Menochius.

Swedenborg interprets it as the voluntary life and the intellectual life, or the life of the will and the life of the understanding, to which the natural or animal man is now perfectly conformed; the whole man being thus brought into a state of sabbatical rest. So Cajetan remarks that the intellective soul, made in the image of God, is itself the first principle or origin of breathing. Hence he says that Moses formally describes *respiration* as depending upon the intellective soul. Now it was this intellective life, inspired into man by the Spirit of God, that caused Adam to live in Paradise, as Athanasius\* says, "a true life, even the life of the holy angels."

Hence Philo,† says Bishop Bull,—

"Manifestly places the image of God, *i. e.*, the perfection thereof, after which Adam was created, in those divine characters which were impressed on his soul in his creation, or in the supernatural gift and faculty whereby he was enabled to attain the vision and perfect knowledge of God: and he also asserts that this was the recondite sense of Moses' words in the history of man's creation."

Indeed so far from disapproving of this view of the subject, Bishop Bull maintains that it is substantially the same with that of the Church of God in all ages. Hence he says with Tertullian,‡ that in man made after the image of God, man's soul was exalted and lifted up to the highest altitude. He was *Deo de proximo amicus*, so that he could *celestia por-*

\* Bishop Bull on *The State of Man before the Fall*, p. 102.

† *The State of Man before the Fall*, vol. ii., p. 118.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 124.

*tare* bear heavenly things, and sustain the approaches of the Shechinah or majestic presence of God.

"For\* if it be once granted, that man in his first and best estate was a creature merely animal, I challenge any man to shew me, wherein that great fall of mankind, of which the Scriptures and the writings of the catholic doctors from the days of the Apostles to our present age so loudly ring, can be imagined to consist—

" 'Qui cadit in terram, non habet unde cadat.'

"According to this hypothesis, man before the fall was but an earthly animal creature, and he is no worse now since the fall."

But of this, more in the sequel.

Now Jehovah God is said to have breathed this life into the *nostrils* of man. "By† the *nostrils* are signified," says Eucherius, "that *discretion* or *discrimination* by means of which we choose the virtues and reprobate the vices." Hence the expression, "*noses have they and smell not*," when applied to man, signifies those who have the faculty for perceiving spiritual odors, and yet exercise no spiritual discernment.

The life, therefore, which is now breathed into the *nostrils* signifies not an involuntary life, but a life chosen by the man himself in virtue of the judgment, discretion, or discrimination which he has now acquired, and which is divinely inspired even into his very sensuous and corporeal principle; *i. e.*, from the internal into the external man. And this interpretation illustrates what is said in Job,†

\* *Ibid.*, p. 130. † Lauretus, art. *Nares*. ‡ Chap. xxxii. 8.



"I said, Days should speak, and multitude of years should teach wisdom. But there is a spirit in man: and the *inspiration* of the Almighty giveth them *understanding*." And so again in the Wisdom of Solomon,\* "He knew not his Maker, and him that *inspired* into him an active soul, and breathed in a *living spirit*."

This seems to be implied in the observations even of certain Commentators: "The Lord animated or inspired him," says the Assembly, "with a living and reasonable soul or spirit, which presently appeared by breath at his nostrils;"—where it is evident, that the breath of the body is made to depend upon that of the spirit.

Hence the Apostle's exhortation to be "renewed by the Spirit of their mind," where Chrysostom gives us this paraphrase of the words, "by the Spirit which is in their minds." For the learned Jews, says Bishop Bull,†

... "Beside or above the *νοῦς* or highest natural faculty in man's soul, believed another principle necessary in order to a supernatural life, viz., the divine Spirit; and that this divine Spirit immediately affects only the *νοῦς*, and so is fitly termed Πνεῦμα τοῦ νοῦς, being from thence derived into the inferior faculties."

Hence this prelate observes, that it is very reasonable thus to interpret the text; as St. Paul, in discoursing of other mysteries of the Christian religion, has the same common notions with Philo, and other Jews which were before him. This Spirit or *Nesama*,‡

\* Chap. xv. 11. † *The State of Man before the Fall*, p. 97.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 95. See our *Appendix*.

observes the Bishop who was no mystic, is that *Nesama* in his mind which man lost by his sin and folly. This Spirit, he maintains, is the Spirit of God which Adam received, in order to a celestial life and the attainment of the beatific vision.

The *breath of lives*, therefore, here breathed into man, does not mean the breath of the material body; for this the body had when man was in a state of Chaos. Though spiritually dead then, he nevertheless breathed as to his body—a breath which was not the breath of life, but the breath of the senses, the breath of the animal, thus the breath in virtue of which the animal man exercised the bodily senses. The breath *now* received by man was that in virtue of which he respired from the *Nesama*, hence from the affections and thoughts which controlled and directed the breath of the material body; so that man *now* respired from *within* as well as from without; and this interior respiration being the predominant, the exterior became subordinate and ceased to be a subject of direct consciousness.

On this subject Swedenborg observes,\* "Concerning this *respiration* nothing can as yet be said; inasmuch as at this day it is a subject altogether hidden and unknown; notwithstanding, the most ancient people had a perfect knowledge of it, as they also have who are in another life. But there is not a single person on earth at present who is at all acquainted with it. It is from this ground that they likened spirit or life to wind."

There is, therefore, in the remark of Professor

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 97.

Jowett a meaning beyond his meaning when he said, "Of this aboriginal state we only entertain conjecture: it is beyond the horizon even when the eye is strained to the uttermost." Nevertheless, we may be convinced that such a respiration or breathing of the spirit there must be. Life and respiration are intimately connected with each other. When the body dies, the spirit of man survives and continues to breathe: that respiration comes into consciousness which had been tacit during the abode of the spirit in the body. For as the corruptible body presseth down the soul and the earthly tabernacle weigheth down the mind; so the respiration of the body preponderates over that of the spirit, and the consciousness of the spiritual is lost in the consciousness of the bodily; and this state of unconsciousness of the spiritual is confirmed by false theories concerning the nature of the soul. "The favorite representation of the soul as a simple substance," says Mr. Mansel,\* "indivisible, and therefore indestructible, is one which, in so far as it is synonymous with continued existence in time, is either untrue or unmeaning." To speak of the respiration of a simple substance would be simply—nonsense. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body; and when the natural body ceases to breathe, the breathing of the spiritual body comes into consciousness.

"It is strange to observe," says Dr. Barclay,† "how many so fondly cherish the fancy that a soul such as ours may in a future state, like the Deity, be able to operate and exercise its various faculties *independently of anything like*

\* *Metaphysics*, p. 370.    † *On Life and Organization*, p. 435.

*corporeal organs.* The Sacred Scriptures afford no encouragement to entertain any such hypothesis. They explicitly inform us that the human soul after its departure from the present body shall inhabit another which is to be immortal ; a species of body which, for aught we know, may be as different from the present body as is the loathsome and the crawling caterpillar from the winged, the active, and the splendid butterfly ; two species of forms which in the progress of expanding faculties, are constructed by the same *animating principle*. What the form and the structure of the new and immortal body are to be, we neither know nor have any means of knowing ; but that the same animating principle may in different circumstances construct new bodies and successively pass from one into the other, is what we know from daily observation. Even Plato, amidst all his refinements and abstractions, never imagined that the soul could be at any time without a body, or something equivalent, which he called a vehicle."

Surely, if the soul or rather spirit be clothed with a body in the Spiritual World, it will be with a human body. If the spirit after death ceased to be human, we might say that it would not then be clothed with a human body. But if it be the spirit which constitutes the man,\* and the man be clothed with a spiritual body, it must be a body so organized as to be suitable to man ; and what is this but the body of its own spirit ; in other words, a human body ? Indeed, the animating principle is even now constructing the very spiritual body which shall serve to clothe us hereafter. This human spiritual body has functions, and one of its functions is the *respiration* of

\* See our *Appendix*.

which we have spoken. For while the material body serves for the animal man, there must be a spiritual body for the spiritual man ; and there is a distinct respiration proper to each. This fact seems to have been in a manner recognized by a German writer :—

“If\* we observe the course of our feelings,” says he, “by pauses or as it were by pulsations, and of our thoughts, we shall always see a new crisis of comprehension, and of a renewed internal tension, succeeding a moment of relaxation or dissipation. These are the *respirations* and *pulsations* of the inner life, which are most perceptible where this life attains its highest and noblest elevation.”

Now the highest and noblest elevation to which the inner life attains, is when it is in correspondence with the love, wisdom, and power of God ; when the heart beats with love, and the lungs breathe wise thoughts, and the actions are performed from these as motives ; for in this case the functions of the mind act with a strong energy, and the inner man is more fully brought into the outer, so that the outer is a manifestation of the inner.

How it was that the outer life was a manifestation of the inner we proceed to explain ; and we shall then see what was the nature of that celestial life, or beatific vision, to which Adam is said to have attained in Paradise—an enquiry which can be no mere speculation. For if Paradise has been lost, Paradise may be regained ; but in order to regain Paradise, the life must be regained which Adam led in Paradise. But how can we regain it if the whole subject is incomprehensible ? Is that which has

\* Menzel's *German Literature*, vol. iii., p. 60.

been lost in this world, lost for ever? To the Church of Ephesus, who had fallen from her first love, it was promised, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of *the Tree of Life* which is in the midst of the *Paradise* of God."

How was it then that, in Adam, the outer or sensuous corporeal life was a manifestation of the inner? We have seen that Dean Trench on the *Parables*,\* admits the following principle to be true:†—

"When God created this lower world," says R. Simeon Ben Jochai, "he created it according to the pattern of the world above, in order that this world might be the image of the world above; and his reason for so doing was, that the one world might be connected with the other."

It is on this principle that Swedenborg records, concerning the Adamic Church,‡ that "The objects of the outward senses, such as terrestrial and worldly things, were to them as nothing; nor did they perceive any delight in them, but only in the things which they *signified* and *represented*. Wherefore, when they saw terrestrial objects they did not think at all about them, but only about those which they *signified* and *represented*, which to them were most delightful; being such things as exist in heaven, by virtue whereof they saw the Lord himself."

As the outward world was thus to the Adamic Church a manifestation of the inner, so the outer or sensuous life was a manifestation of the inner or rational life; for the senses perceived from the

\* *Notes on the Parables*, p. 13.

† Archdeacon Lyall's *Propædia Prophetica*, p. 264.

‡ *Arcana Celestia*, art. 1122.

reason: the rational life was the soul of the sensuous, and the sensuous life was thus in perfect correspondence with the rational.

8. "*And the Lord God planted a garden Eastward in Eden, and there he put the man whom he had formed.*"

When our Lord said, "Every *plant* which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up," he did not mean to exclude the co-operation of man, and assign the work of planting to God only, apart from the will of man. For although it is God who plants, yet He doeth it in man and by man; and therefore when the Lord God planted a garden in Eden, it was man who planted it by the help of God, and God who planted it through the instrumentality of man. But all is assigned to the Lord God, that man may appropriate no merit to himself.

What, however, was the *Garden* which was thus planted? We have already seen that man had attained to the angelic life; and therefore the garden of Eden had relation to that life, or it could have been no garden of delight to Adam, for there would have been in it nothing to cherish that life. As then *heaven* and *earth* were the heaven and earth of the human mind, it follows that the *Garden* upon the earth was the garden also of the human mind; and thus that Adam or the Church was that garden. Hence in *Jeremiah*\* the *soul* is spoken of as a *watered garden* — "Therefore they shall come and sing in the height of Zion, and shall flow together to the goodness of the Lord, for wheat, and for wine, and for oil, and

\* Chap. xxxi. 12.

for the young of the flock and of the herd, and their *soul* shall be as a *watered garden*; and they shall not sorrow any more at all." On which a Commentator observes, that\* "our *souls* are never valuable as *gardens* but when they are watered with the dews of God's spirit and grace."

So again in *Isaiah* :†—"The Lord shall guide thee continually, and satisfy thy *soul* in drought, and make fat thy bones : and thou shalt be like a *watered garden*, and like a spring of water, whose waters fail not."

And again :‡—"Ye shall be like an oak whose leaf fadeth, and as a *garden* which hath no water."

So in the *Canticles* :§—"A *garden enclosed* is my sister, my spouse, a spring shut up, a fountain sealed ;" signifying, says Bishop Patrick, "the Church bringing forth not only the fruits of godliness and virtue, but all sorts and variety of fruit like an excellent *garden*. And indeed in the prophetical language the flourishing condition of the Church, after it hath been in affliction, is set forth by the planting of a wilderness with all sorts of the best trees, and by making fountains break forth and waters flow therein." So another Commentator :—"The bridegroom having called the Bride an *enclosed garden*, carries on the metaphor, and compares her virtues and accomplishments to all the choicest productions of an Eastern *orchard*." So again :||—"Sanctified *souls* are as *gardens* ; gardens of the Lord enclosed for him. Graces in the soul are as spices in these gardens—that in them which is valuable and useful."

\* Henry's *Commentary*.    † Chap. lviii. 11.    ‡ Chap. i. 30.  
§ Chap. iv. 12.    || Henry's *Commentary*—*Canticles* iv. 15.



So likewise Ambrose: \*—"If Paradise be a place in which shrubs grew up, then is the *soul* which multiplies the seed that is sown into it, seen to be a *Paradise*; in which is implanted every virtue; in which also is the Tree of Life, *i.e.*, *wisdom*, as Solomon said. For wisdom cometh not from the earth, but is of the Father."

The Garden mentioned by Plato in his *Symposium*, and into which Love is represented as entering, St. Ambrose† thinks was originally borrowed by Plato from the *Canticles*.

"It is," says he, "from this book of *Canticles* that he took the idea; because the soul adhering to God entered into the *garden of the rational mind*, in which was an abundance of various virtues, and of flowers of discourse. Who is there that is ignorant, that from out of the Paradise we read of in Genesis, which has the tree of life, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and other trees, the abundance of the virtues ought to be transferred, and planted in the *garden of the rational mind*; by which, in the *Song of Songs*, Solomon signified the *garden of the soul, or the soul itself*."

Now it is generally acknowledged‡ by writers, ancient and modern, that this Garden of Eden was a *type of heaven*. The observations of Parkhurst upon this subject are to the same purport.§

"And Jehovah Aleim planted a *Garden* eastward in Eden; surely not for the purpose of a mere Mahomedan Paradise, but as a school of religious instruction to our first parents. Many arguments might be adduced in confirmation of this

\* *De Paradiso*, vol. i., chap. i.

† *De Bono Mortis*, vol. i., chap. v.

‡ Bishop Bull on the *State of Man before the Fall*, p. 67.

§ See his *Hebrew Lexicon*, art. 22.

truth. Such a method of teaching by the emblems of Paradise was suited to the nature of man, who is capable of information concerning spiritual things, by analogy from outward and sensible objects. It was also agreeable to the ensuing dispensations of God, who, in that religion which commenced on the Fall, and was in substance reinstituted by Moses, did instruct his people in spiritual truths or the good things to come, by sensible and visible objects, rites, and ceremonies; by the Cherubim, Gen. iii. 24; by sacrifices, Gen. iv. 4 (comp. Heb. xi. 4); by the distinction of clean and unclean animals, Gen. vii. 2; by abstinence from blood, Gen. ix. 4; by the institution of priests, altars, burnt offerings, drink offerings, holy washings, etc., Gen. xiv. 18 (comp. Exod. xxiv. 5); Gen. viii. 20; xxii. 13; xxv. 2, 14. And even under the Christian state, much of our religious knowledge is communicated to us partly by the Scriptures referring us for ideas of spiritual and heavenly things to the visible works of God's creation, to the emblems of Paradise, and to the types of the Patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations; partly, by the ordinance of the sabbath day; and partly, by the two sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which are outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual benefits."

.... "Know, says Rabbi Simon Bar Abraham, that in the trees, fountains, and other things of the Garden of Eden, were the figures of the most curious things by which the first Adam saw and understood spiritual things; even as God hath given to us the forms and figures of the tabernacle, of the sanctuary, and of all his furniture, the candlesticks, the table, and the altars, for *types of intellectual things*, and that we might from them understand heavenly truths. But no doubt those particulars were more plain and clear to Adam in the garden of Eden wherein he dwelt, as he also was more holy, being a creature formed by the hands of God himself, and an

angel of God. In the *trees* likewise, and *fountains* or *rivers* of the garden, he prefigured admirable mysteries."

The method of proceeding by analogy in the attainment of this spiritual knowledge, is well stated by the author of the *Figurative Language of Holy Scripture* :\*—

"From the difficulty we are under of comprehending such things as are above natural reason, the manner of the Scripture is as extraordinary as its matter: and it must be so from the necessity of the case. Of all the objects of sense we have ideas, and our minds and memories are stored with them. But of invisible things we have no ideas till they are pointed out to us by Revelation: and as we cannot know them immediately, such as they are in themselves, after the manner in which we know sensible objects, they must be communicated to us by the mediation of such things as we already comprehend. For this reason, the Scripture is found to have a language of its own, which does not consist of *words*, but of signs and figures taken from visible *things*. It could not otherwise treat of God, who is a Spirit, and of the spirit of man, and of a spiritual world; which no words can describe. *Words* are the arbitrary signs of natural things; but the language of Revelation goes a step farther, and uses some *things* as the signs of other *things*; in consequence of which, the World which we now see becomes a sort of commentary on the mind of God, and explains the World in which we believe."

Now it is a common observation, that our knowledge of the Spiritual World must necessarily be confused and indistinct. This confusion and indistinctness we have seen to be a state proper to *Chaos*, and Chaos represents the first state of the natural

\* Rev. W. Jones, of Nayland, p. 11.

mind in regard to spiritual things. The whole of the first chapter of Genesis, therefore, represents the process by which we are brought out of this state of indistinctness and confusion, into those clear perceptions of heavenly truth which are proper to the state of Paradise. Hence, as we have seen, the first divine process was the infusion of *light*, by which alone could clear distinctions be made; so that on the second day the distinction was first made between things natural and spiritual, earthly and heavenly.\* Till this period heavenly things, or heaven, had lain hid within earthly things, or the earth, nay, even the earth itself was not duly developed; but in the Paradisiacal state man has a clear perception of the heavenly within the earthly, or of the spiritual within the natural. This spiritual perception, therefore, is a work of Jehovah God in the mind of Adam; and before this distinction had been wrought, had he been introduced into Paradise, he would have seen nothing

\* Hence Augustin in his Tractate *De Genesi contra Manichæos* observes, *art.* 11, “*In principio fecit Deus cælum et terram; non quia jam hoc erat, sed quia hoc esse poterat; nam et cælum scribitur postea factum.*” Hence he observes, “*sic dictum est quasi semen cœli and terræ,*” as if the heaven and earth had first existed in a seminal state, *i.e.*, as if the human mind had first existed seminally or potentially, as we have already noticed at the commencement of the present chapter. In this case, the expression “*In the beginning*” might be considered as having reference to this inchoative and seminal condition.

We may further remark, that the six days which follow, Augustin refers to six states of the human mind; thus in *lib.* i., *art.* 43: “*Habeat enim unusquisque nostrum in bonis operibus et recta vita tanquam distinctos istos sex dies, post quos debet quietem sperare. Primo die lucem fidei,*” etc.

but what our modern literalists see—objects of *sense* and natural *science*—but nothing more; for in this respect his condition in Paradise would not be the least advanced beyond his condition out of it. It was only when the mind of Adam had been so formed as to have attained to a clear perception of celestial things, that he was brought into the Paradisaical state, and thus into Paradise. For this reason Adam is spoken of with express reference to this preformation—“And there He put the man whom *He had formed*,”—the mind in its natural or chaotic state being without form.

But does not the expression **THE MAN** imply only one human being? In proof that this is the case it is said;—

“In\* verse 26 we read, ‘And God said, Let us make man (Adam, without article) in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion,’ etc. Here the language is indefinite. It refers to the whole human race. But then follows, ‘And God created *the* man (Adam, with the article) in His image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them.’ Here the language is definite, ‘*the man*,’ and in the first half of the verse the pronoun is in the singular number, and the masculine gender, ‘In the image of God created He him.’ If the author had intended briefly to have stated, that at first *only one human being*, and that one the male, was created, what other language could he have employed?”

If, however, the expression *the man* signifies only one individual male human being, does it not follow that when it is said, “So he drove out *the man*,” that

\* The Mosaic Record of Creation in *Aids to Faith*, p. 230.

only one individual male human being was excluded from Paradise?

When God said, Let us make *Man*\*—"That which is here said of the *Man* is also to be understood of the *Woman*; or, which comes to the same, that the *Woman* is here comprehended under the *Man*, is evident from the latter part of the next following verse, '*Male and Female created he them*;' whereas no express mention had been afore made of any other than the *Man*, and therefore under that word must be comprehended also the *Woman*. The same is likewise evident from other instances in this account of Moses, particularly chap. iii. 23, 24. In the former of which verses it is expressed only, that God sent HIM from the garden of Eden, and in the latter that God drove out *the Man*: but now no one doubts but that the *Woman* was also driven out, and therefore is to be understood as comprehended under the *Man*. In short, that both sexes were comprehended under the common name of *Man*, is evident from chap. v. 2."

According to this account, when it is said, "God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him," Adam is not to be regarded as one person. Nor, indeed, in chap. v., where it is said, "This is the book of the generations of Adam;" for though,† as we have seen, some critics assert that by *Adam* is here meant one individual male human being, yet the version of the Septuagint is *Αὐτῆ ἡ βιβλος γενέσεως ἀνθρώπων*—"This is the book of the generation of *men*" (Adam), an expression far from implying a single individual. Calmet gives a similar interpretation; and indeed Von Bohlen af-

\* Wells on the Old Testament, vol. i., p. 12.

† *Aids to Faith*, p. 230.

firms, that even "with the article, *Adam* signifies the human race." A Lapide observes, that both the man and the woman were called *Adam*, to signify that they were one man in two bodies, and so ought to be one in soul and in will.

It seems then impossible, in regard to the use of the term *Adam* in this narrative in Genesis, to single out any one passage in which it necessarily implies only one individual human being. Therefore, whether the whole human race originally descended from a single pair or not, is an open question which the Book of Genesis does not determine. That it treats of a species under the name of *Adam*, and not of an individual, is plain from the admissions of many Commentators; and of how many that species consisted is nowhere asserted. The interpretation of Swedenborg is, that *Adam* was the name of a *Church*; and as there were those who lived before this Church was formed, or before they belonged to the Church called *Adam*, or had reached the Adamic state, there were in this sense *Pre-Adamites*.

9. "*And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of lives also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.*"

Does every tree that is pleasant to the sight mean only every tree that is pleasant to the natural eye? Are merely natural beauties sufficient for the spiritual mind? Surely if the earthly Paradise be typical of the heavenly, the earthly *trees* will be typical of the heavenly. Hence Parkhurst observes—

"That\* two of the trees of Paradise, that of life and that of the knowledge of good and evil, were of a typical and emblematic nature: the one the sacrament of life, Gen. ii. 9; iii. 22; the other of death, Gen. ii. 17; iii. 17—19. And so after the Fall the rough leaves of the Fig-tree were used by our first parents as a symbol of contrition, Gen. iii. 7. And since in that sacred garden, Gen. ii. 9, was also every tree that was pleasant to the sight or good for food, surely of the *soul* of man as well as of his body it may safely be inferred, that *the whole garden* was so contrived by Infinite Wisdom as to represent and inculcate, on the minds of our first parents, a *plan or system of religious truths* revealed to them by their Creator; especially since the Paradisiacal emblems of trees (see Lev. xxiii. 10; Nehemiah xviii. 15), plants, waters, and the like, are frequently applied by the succeeding inspired writers to represent spiritual objects and convey spiritual lessons, and that with a simplicity and beauty not to be paralleled from any human writer (see *inter alia*, Isaiah xli. 18—20; lviii. 11; Jer. xvii. 7, 8). To all which may be added, that the garden of Eden itself is by the prophets alluded to as a place of *spiritual* knowledge, joy, and happiness (see Isaiah li. 3; Ezek. xxviii. 13; xxxvi. 35); and in the New Testament the name *Paradeisos* Paradise, which the Seventy almost constantly use for *Gan*, when relating to the garden of Eden, is applied to the intermediate state of happy spirits between death and the resurrection, and even to the eternal joys of heaven. See Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. xii. 4; Rev. ii. 7; comp. Rev. xxii. 1—3."

Of these *trees* we shall speak further in the sequel; in the meantime we observe, that the *tree of lives* is said to be in the midst of the garden; but it is not here said that *the tree of the knowledge of good and*

\* *Hebrew Lexicon*, art. 22.



*evil* was in the midst of the garden; for this tree is not described as being in the midst of the garden, till after the serpent had entered into it. In the Book of *Proverbs* it is said, that "*Wisdom is a Tree of Life* to them that lay hold upon her;" on which a Commentator\* observes, "That like as Paradise tropologically signified the holy soul ever rejoicing in the cheerful verdure, and fruit, and flower of every virtue, so the *Tree of Life* represented *wisdom*, or *virtue* generically." According to Swedenborg, the *Tree of Lives* signifies not so much wisdom as the *perceptions* of wisdom. We have already seen that there exists an analogy between the vegetable kingdom and man; and the analogy between the two is so great in the present case, that we may speak of the *leaves* of the tree as the *lungs* of the tree; *leaves* being the organs by which the tree respire. It is from this function that the tree derives its spiritual meaning; for it is from *respiration* that is derived *sensitive perception*. Thus the *tree of lives* is then in the midst of the Garden, when the perceptions of love and wisdom are made to occupy the very centre of a man's being, and he loves Divine wisdom before all things. The Garden itself was planted *Eastward* in Eden: *Eastward*, i.e., says Augustin, "toward the Orient light of wisdom:" "in *Eden*," i.e., says he, "in the midst of immortal and intellectual delights."

But there is also the *Tree of the Knowledge of good and evil* in the garden.

"It is not the knowledge of evil," says Ambrose,† "that

\* iii. 18, A Lapide.

† *De Paradiso*, art. 34.

is evil, but only when the act fulfils the evil. For he who knows evil that it is evil, does not forthwith do it : but he is evil who, knowing it to be evil, does it. The incentive to do evil is, generally, either anger or cupidity. Nor does it follow that he who knows what is evil, would do what he knows to be wicked, unless he is overcome with anger or cupidity. For this reason we say, that the incentive to sin is either anger, or cupidity, or frequently fear ; although cupidity itself arises from fear, when a person desires to avoid what he fears."

Thus far, however, there is no real desire of that which is evil, but only a knowledge that it is evil, *i.e.*, contrary to Divine order. This is compatible with a state of perfect innocence, and is essential to a freedom of choice between good and evil.

10. "*And a river went out of Eden to water the garden ; and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads.*"

As *Eden* signifies *delight*, *i. e.*, the delight arising from love, so it is from this source of love that the *river* is represented as proceeding. Its efflux from its internal source to its external bounds is then described. That this *river*, with its branches, going forth from the land of delights, has reference to the pleasures of wisdom and knowledge, is obviously indicated by the passage in *Ecclesiasticus*,\*—"The Lord Almighty is God alone, and beside Him there is no other Saviour. He filleth all things with His *wisdom*, as *Phison* and as *Tigris* in the time of the new fruits. He maketh the *understanding* to abound like *Euphrates*, and as *Jordan* in the time of the harvest. He maketh the *doctrine of knowledge* appear as the

\* Chap. xxiv. 24, and *seq.*

light, and as *Geon* in the time of vintage. The first man knew her not perfectly, no more shall the last find her out."—Here then is a reference to wisdom, understanding, and knowledge, in connection with the first Adam in Paradise. According to Swedenborg, a *river out of Eden* signifies wisdom proceeding from love. St. Ambrose\* observes, "There is a river the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God, the Holy Place of the Tabernacle of the Most High. There is a river which goes out of Eden, and compasses the whole earth, viz., the *Word of God*, by which the intelligible Paradise is watered, and every soul is invited to partake of the grace of Christ. The Word of God Himself saying, 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters and drink.'"—Many modern commentators regard this river as being the *Word of God*, which is Divine Wisdom; and think that to this allusion is made by the Psalmist† when he said, "Thou shalt make them to drink of the river of thy pleasures." Now this wisdom proceeding from love, branches out into four heads,—the will, the intellect, reason, and science.

11. "*The name of the first is Pison; that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold.* 12. *And the gold of that land is good: there is bdellium, and the onyx stone.*" When this river of God reaches the human mind,‡ it is parted

\* Psalm xlv. 4.

† Psalm xxxvi. 8.

‡ St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and other fathers, regard the four rivers as signifying the four cardinal virtues—Prudence, Temperance, Fortitude, and Justice. Swedenborg regards them as relating to the whole mind of man in his Paradisiacal state. See our *Appendix*.

into four heads; the first having relation to the *will*. Whence *Pison* signifies the abundance of truths of the Divine Word nourishing the affections of the will, or the perceptions of good.

13. "*And the name of the second river is Gihon: the same is that which encompasseth the whole land of Cush.*" From the perceptions of goodness flow those of truth. Hence *Gihon* signifies the abundance of truths of the Divine Word, which afford increase to *intelligence*.

14. "*And the name of the third river is Hiddekel; that is it which goeth toward the east of Assyria.*" From intelligence flows clear and correct reason. *Hiddekel*, therefore, signifies the abundance of truths which supply the faculty of reason.

15. "*And the fourth river is Euphrates,*" which, as being the outermost, signifies the abundance of truths which filled to overflowing the memory, and thus which are regarded as matters of science.

If the *Paradise* be that of the human mind, as also its *trees* and *rivers*, so also must be the *lands* or *countries* in which the trees were planted, and through which the rivers flowed. Now the lands mentioned are Havilah, Cush or Ethiopia, and Assyria. The question is, what do they signify? We know that throughout the Bible cities and countries had a prophetic signification. Thus\* Augustine upon this passage:—

"So in like manner *Jerusalem*, although it was a visible and earthly place, nevertheless signifies spiritually the city of peace; and *Zion*, although it was an earthly mountain, sig-

\* *De Genesi contra Manichæos*, lib. ii., art. 13.

nifies nevertheless far extended vision, and in the allegories of Scripture is frequently transferred to spiritual things ; so in the case of him who went down from Jerusalem to *Jericho*, as the Lord said, and was wounded on the way, and was left by thieves disabled and half-dead, we are compelled to understand these places in a spiritual sense, although historically they have an existence upon earth."

It is evident, therefore, that although these rivers and lands be considered to have a geographical reality, yet that St. Augustine regarded them also as having a spiritual signification. Indeed, it is puerile to suppose that the Creator contemplates the nations and kingdoms of the earth according only to the external and artificial distributions made by man. If we wish to see what part they sustain in the various dispensations of Divine Providence, thus in their relation to the Church, we must see what is the principle of distribution adopted by the Almighty himself ; for the original divisions of the nations and people spread over the earth, arose not from political but spiritual causes ; and are attributed not to *man*, but to the *Most High*. Accordingly we read in *Deuteronomy*,\* — "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel." Now the children of Israel were divided into twelve tribes, each of them having its own signification, as is evident from the seventh chapter of the Apocalypse: These tribes represent the Israel of God, the inhabitants of the heavenly Canaan, thus all the hosts of heaven, con-

\* Chap. xxxii. 8.

sequently every genus and species of heavenly love and truth.

It was in relation to these Twelve Tribes, or one or other of them, that all other countries in the world were primarily disposed by the Almighty, and thus became endowed with their prophetic signification or character. The principles upon which the Twelve Tribes were chosen, existed before they were chosen, and were the principles upon which the people and nations of the earth were classified before the election and distribution of the Twelve Tribes; that is to say, they were all collectively representative of the same spiritual qualities which the Twelve Tribes themselves represented, or else of their contraries. Hence on Deut. xxxii. 8, Swedenborg observes :\* "These things are said concerning the Churches which preceded the Church that was instituted among the Israelites. The Most Ancient Church, which was before the Flood (viz., the Adamic), which was a celestial Church, being principled in the good of love to the Lord, is understood in the clause, 'Those days of old when the Most High divided to the *nations* their inheritance, when He separated the *sons of man* ;' *nations* signifying those who are in the good of love, and the *sons of man* those who are in truths from good. The Ancient Church, which was after the Flood, and was a spiritual Church, is understood in the clause, 'The years of many generations, when the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He set the bounds of the *people* according to the number of the sons of

\* *Apocalypse Explained*, art. 331, 431, 724.

Israel;’ *people* signifying those who are in spiritual good, which is the good of neighborly love or charity; and the number of the *sons of Israel* signifying the same as the twelve tribes, according to which the inheritances were given, as in Ezekiel. . . . *To separate the sons of men and to set their bounds*, signifies to alienate them from falsities, and to gift them with truths; and to *give the inheritance to the nations*, signifies heaven and conjunction with those who are in the good of love.”

According to Swedenborg, Canaan originally extended from the Nile to the Euphrates. Thus it is said,\* “To thy seed have I given this land; from the river of Egypt even unto the great river, the river Euphrates.” This was the region of the primeval Church: hence Eden was the same with Canaan, the Nile being the boundary on one side, and Euphrates on the other. Everything in this region, even in the most ancient times, was significative and representative: in consequence of which, Abram was called to go into that land; Moses to legislate for it; and Joshua to take possession of it; nor was it ever afterwards abandoned till the Wisdom of God had, as it were, worked itself out, and the Word of God was completed by the addition of the Apocalypse. The consummation of the Church in that land, and the completion of the written Word, were coeval. Hence the concluding words of the Apocalypse—“If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book.”

\* Gen. xv. 18. See also 2 Chron. ix. 26; Psalm lxxii. 8; 1 Kings iv. 24.

The great object of Literalism, in the present day, is to destroy the symbolical character of that country, and to place it upon a level with any other part of the earth; thus confounding the distinction between those countries where the Church was planted, and those where it was not, or in other words, the distinction parallel to that between Jews and Gentiles.

"All\* that region," says Swedenborg, "is called the tract of the Church, where those inhabit who are instructed in the doctrine of the true faith; as the land of Canaan, when the Jewish Church was planted therein, and as Europe where the Christian Church is at present planted. The lands and countries which are without, are not tracts of the Church, or 'faces of the ground.' Where the tract of the Church was before the Flood, may also appear from the lands which the rivers encompassed that came forth from the garden of Eden; by which, in all parts of the Word, are likewise described the boundaries of the land of Canaan," etc.

. . . "The† Most Ancient Church, which was called Man or Adam, was in the land of Canaan; consequently the *garden* of Eden was there, by which was there signified the intelligence and wisdom of the men of that Church, and by the *trees* therein their perception. And whereas intelligence and wisdom were signified by that Garden or Paradise, the Church itself is meant thereby; and the Church being meant, Heaven is meant; and since Heaven is meant, in the supreme sense the Lord also is meant."

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 567.

† *Ibid.*, art. 4447.



... "To\* be introduced by Jehovah into the land of Canaan, denotes to be made a Church ; the reason is, because the Church had been in the land of Canaan from the most ancient time, and because *the Word could not be written in any other land*, thus amongst the nation which possessed that land ; and where the Word is, there is the Church. The reason why *the Word could not be written elsewhere* was, because all the places which were in the whole of that land, and which were round about it, as the mountains, the vallies, the rivers, the forests, and the rest, had been made representative of things celestial and spiritual ; and the sense of the letter of the Word, both in the historicals and the propheticals, must necessarily consist of such things ; since the interiors of the Word, which are celestial and spiritual things, close in such representatives, and as it were stand upon them as a house upon its foundation. For unless the Word, as to the sense of the letter, which is its ultimate, stood upon such things, it would be as a house without a foundation."

We are here told that the mountains, vallies, rivers, forests, of the tract of land between the river of Egypt and the river Euphrates, had been made representative. The reason is, because it was inhabited by a race of men who contemplated the things upon earth as patterns of things in the heavens, and who accordingly gave to them names which designated spiritual qualities. It is on this ground that the Word throughout has reference pre-eminently to the land of Canaan ; *i. e.*, as we have seen, to the tract

\* *Ibid.*, art. 10,559.

of country between the river of Egypt and the Euphrates, that is, the tract of country in which was Paradise.

15. "*And Jehovah God took the man, and placed him in the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it.*" He *took* the man as it is said,\* "*And I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God.*" And again,† "*In that day, saith the Lord of hosts, will I take thee, O Zerubbabel my servant, the son of Shealtiel, saith the Lord, and will make thee as a signet; for I have chosen thee, saith the Lord of hosts.*" So again,‡ "*There shall be two in the field; the one shall be taken, the other left.*" The man, therefore, whom the Lord God *took* or *chose* for Paradise, was the man who had thus been perfected; and the office of the man was to cultivate and keep the garden. The first Adam, therefore, was a *gardener*; but so was the second. "When Jesus," says a modern Commentator,§ "*first appeared to Mary Magdalene, and she took Him for the gardener, the mistake was not great; for our blessed Lord was a gardener, because He planted the garden of God, the Church, where the fruits ripen and are made fit for the kingdom of heaven. That St. John should have mentioned the fact of Mary's mistake, renders it highly probable that he had this symbolism directly in view: symbolism attaches in general to all the minuter circumstances that he records.*"

\* *Exodus* vi. 7.      † *Haggai* ii. 23.      ‡ *Matthew* xxiv. 40.

§ *Song of Songs*, a revised translation, with *Introduction* and *Commentary*, by J. F. Thrupp, M.A., Vicar of Barrington, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; p. 182.

Our Lord had said to the thief, "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise;" and if Mary had overheard these words, or even if they had been told her, when she went to the sepulchre to anoint the body of our Lord, she might naturally have thought of His spirit as being in Paradise; and of the Divine Gardener who had planted a garden eastward in Eden, and Adam who had been placed there to dress it and to keep it; particularly as in the place where our Lord was crucified, "there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre wherein was never man yet laid."

Now Adam was placed in the garden to cultivate and keep it. What this means we may infer from the following passage:—"They made me *keeper* of the vineyards, but mine own vineyard have I not *kept*." "Spiritually," says a Commentator,\* "the vineyard is the Church; the *keeping* of this vineyard is the performance of that duty which is entrusted to each individual; hence, he says, 'This vineyard I have not *kept*,' whether through my negligence, or infirmity, or the tyrannical government of others." This is the common interpretation.

The *garden* was entrusted to Adam to dress it and to keep it, but not to call it his own. When Jehovah God planted the garden, the owner was Jehovah Himself; but when the serpent said, "Ye shall be as gods," the object was to transfer the ownership from Jehovah God to Adam, and therefore the man was driven out. When he began to call it

\* See Poole's *Synopsis*; *Cant.* i. 6.

mine, he lost it altogether. To keep the garden, then, obviously implies to retain it by keeping a guard against the entrance of anything from without. And what was there without? That which was afterwards represented by the serpent.

16. "*And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat;*

17. "*But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*"

By the Lord God "commanding the man" is signified, that the man himself perceived that to eat of every tree of the garden would be according to Divine order; and that to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil would not be according to Divine order; thus, that if he did so, he would be in a disorderly state, would lose his peace of mind, and no longer enjoy a sabbath of the soul. Speaking of the tree of life, Bishop Patrick observes:—

"This garden being also *a type of heaven*, perhaps God intended by this tree to represent that immortal life which He meant to bestow upon man with Himself, Rev. xxii. 2. And so St. Austin, in that famous saying of his, *Erat ei in ceteris lignis Alimentum, in isto autem Sacramentum*. In other trees there was nourishment for man, but in this also a sacrament. For it was both a symbol of that life which God had already bestowed upon man, who was hereby put in mind that God was the author of his being and all his enjoyments, and of that life he was to hope for in another world, if he proved obedient."

If, however, it be admitted that Paradise is typical,

so is *all* that is in it typical ; *every* tree of the garden, as well as the tree of lives ; especially as it is from the rivers that the trees draw their nourishment, and if these rivers are typical, so are the *trees* which these rivers feed. Accordingly we read in *Ezekiel*,\* —“ By the river upon the bank thereof, on this side and on that side, shall grow all *trees* for meat, whose *leaves* shall not fade, neither shall the *fruit* thereof be consumed : it shall bring forth *new fruit* according to his months, because their waters they issued out of the sanctuary : and the *fruit* thereof shall be for meat, and the *leaf* thereof for medicine.”

It is universally admitted, that the description here given is of the trees in Paradise, and that here they are *all* typical, having no reference whatever to the food for the material body. Now if we regard, in the present instance, the trees as growing on each side of the river, it will follow, that as there are four orders of rivers, so there are four orders of trees, and the quality of the trees may be inferred from that of the rivers. Hence we have trees symbolical of the life of love, of intelligence, of reason, and of science ; of all which man might eat ; the inmost or central life of all being the life of love, fed by the river *Pison*, from that which flowed out of the land of delights. Such is the meaning of *every* tree of the garden.

With respect to the *Tree of lives* and the *Tree of the knowledge of good and evil*, it is said of both of them, that the Lord God made them to grow out of the *ground* ; and both of them are represented as

\* Chap. xlvii. 12.

being in Paradise. The man in Paradise, therefore, must have had a knowledge, though external, of *evil*, as well as of good; for if not, how could he choose good rather than evil? This knowledge, however, which was only external, was a knowledge of evil from good; *i. e.*, from the Lord; so that from good or from the Lord he could perceive the nature of evil. But to appropriate the evil, which was signified by transferring the tree from the circumference to the centre, thus destroying Divine order, and then eating of the tree, he was not allowed to do, *i. e.*, he perceived that this would be a perversion of order. For as *eating* is for the nourishment of life, so to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, is to convert a knowledge of evil into a life of evil. An angel, from the light that is in him, perceives the nature of a devil; but this he does in perfect innocence, without appropriating to himself the qualities of the devil. In Paradise, therefore, the nature of evil may be known, but not appropriated.

"How is it," asks Ambrose,\* "that if there were no knowledge of good and evil, we could learn any difference between good and evil? For neither could we judge of evil, that it is evil, unless there were a knowledge of good; nor could there be a knowledge of good, unless there were good. Nor again as to what good is, should we know that it is good, unless there were a knowledge of evil."

Good and evil are correlative terms: we may know evil from good, but we cannot know good from evil.

\* *De Paradiso Liber Unus*, art. 8.

The Tree of lives is said to be in the *midst* of the garden ; and must have been therefore by the river as it went out of Eden. On the other hand, the river which furnished truths for the *memory* or for *science* was Euphrates, which formed the *boundary* of the garden ; hence the Tree of knowledge was on the banks of this river, consequently in the circumference of Paradise. This was the true order of the mind in the more flourishing state of the Adamic Church : that order is disturbed when the tree of knowledge is transferred from the circumference to the centre, or indeed in any degree from without to within, as we shall find was afterwards the case.

18. "*And the Lord God said, It is not good that man should be alone ; I will make him an help meet for him.*"

Hitherto the man had been *alone* ; but, in conformity to the interpretations previously offered, the man himself also now thought that it was not good for him to be *alone*.

Down to this period the history of the Adamic Church has been one of progression. We now come to another phase in the Church, brought about by another generation of men, the descendants of the former. Hitherto all had been good, and from good had proceeded to be very good. We here arrive at the first pause in this progress ; not to a positive evil, but to a *not-good*. And yet the good pronounced to be a *not-good*, is nevertheless in itself a good ; nay, is even *very good* ; but the state of man is altered, and that which before was to him very good, has now become unsuited, and relatively a *not-good*. "It is

*not good* for man to be *alone*." What is here signified by being *alone*?

The term *alone* is used in the Scriptures both in a good sense, and in a bad sense.

It is used in a good sense in the following passages. In *Jeremiah* :\*—"Arise, go up to the quiet nation that dwelleth confidently, which have neither gates nor bars, which dwell *alone*." Again, in *Deuteronomy* :†—"Israel shall then dwell confidently *alone*." Again, in *Numbers* :‡—"Lo, the people shall dwell *alone*, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." For the nations were in evils, and represented the evils in which they were. Hence in *Psalms* cvi. 34 it is said, "They did not destroy the nations concerning whom the Lord commanded them; but were mingled among the heathen, and learned their works. And they served their idols, which were a snare unto them." Accordingly it is said: "I‡ am the Lord your God, which have *separated* you from other people. . . . Ye shall be holy unto me, for I the Lord am holy, and have *severed* you from other people, that ye should be mine." It was thus good that the Jewish people should be *alone* in the land of Canaan, or separated from others; like the Adamic Church in Paradise. Wherefore also the Apostle|| says, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? . . . . Wherefore come out from

\* Chap. xlix. 31. † Chap. xxxiii. 28. ‡ Chap. xxiii. 9.

§ *Leviticus* xx. 24, 26.

|| 2 *Cor.* vi. 14, 15, 17.



among them, and be ye *separate*, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you." Their not being *separate* is thus referred to in *Jeremiah* :\* "Judah is gone into captivity because of affliction, and because of great servitude: she *dwellleth among the heathen*, she findeth no rest." That is, says a Commentator,† "Those that were *separated* from the heathen now dwell among the heathen; those that were a *peculiar* people are now a mingled people." And Cardinal Hugo, "She *dwell among the nations*, that is, those vices which are signified by the seven nations which the Lord cast out from the land of promise."

So again:‡—"I sat not in the assembly of the mockers, nor rejoiced: I sat *alone*, because of thy hand." On which Origen observes:—

"When we imitate the life of the multitude, so that it is not separated from them, and is no better or choiceworthy than that of the many, I cannot say 'I sat *alone*,' but, 'I sat with the multitude.' But when my life is of such a nature as to be difficult of imitation both in manners, morals, action, and wisdom, so that among others I am *alone*, because no one imitates my example; then I can say, 'I sat *alone*.'"

So again:—

"Let every one follow this example, when seeing the multitude not tolerating him who leads a righteous life: even as Elias when he said, 'Lord, they have slain thy prophets, overthrown thine altars, and I am left *alone*, and they seek my life to destroy it.' He, however, who does not lead a life separated from that of the many, cannot say, 'I sat *alone*.'"

\* *Lamentations* i. 3.

† Matthew Henry *in loc.*

‡ *Jeremiah* xv. 17. Works of Origen, vol. iii., 219, 296.

. . . Moreover he sits *alone* who is not harassed by a multitude of passions, but who has withdrawn entirely into the recesses of the rational mind, and the unity of his being."

Again, in the *Psalms* :\* "But know that the Lord hath *set apart* him that is godly for himself: the Lord will hear when I call unto him." Hence on the words,† "A *garden enclosed* is my sister, my spouse," commonly considered to be an allegorical description of the Church, it has been said, "Observe the peculiarity of this *garden*: it is a *garden enclosed*, a *Paradise separated* from the common earth: it is *appropriated* to God: He has set it *apart* for Himself. Israel is God's portion, the lot of His inheritance."

In these passages, to dwell apart, or separately from the world, and thus to dwell *alone*, is used in a good sense; and the Adamic Church would be *alone* in respect to those who were without, and among the nations, and who had not yet reached the *Paradisiacal* state.

As long, then, as the Adamic Church thought the truth from a principle of love, in this case love and truth were united as among the angels; hence it was in a state of celestial marriage, and thus *alone*, or separated from others, in a good sense.

On the other hand, there is an unfavorable sense in which the term *alone* is used.

"If‡ I judge, my judgment is true," said our Saviour, "for I am not *alone*; but I and the Father that sent me."—"He§ that sent me, is with me:

\* iv. 3.

† *Canticles* iv. 12. Matthew Henry *in loc.*

‡ *John* viii. 16.

§ *Ibid.*, viii. 29.

the Father hath not left me *alone* ; for I do always those things that please Him.”—“The\* words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works.”—“Yet shall be scattered every man to his own, and shall leave me *alone* ; and yet I am not *alone*, because my Father is with me.”

From these words it is evident, that Adam might be regarded as being, in a bad sense, *alone* when he ceased to do those things which were pleasing to Jehovah God ; and the reason why he would cease to do them, would be, because he had begun to do them from himself, contrary to our Lord's example when He said, “I† do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.”

When the Adamic Church thought the truth and did the truth from a principle of love, it corresponded with that state of our Lord in which He thought Divine Truth and performed Divine works from the Father; hence He, as the Divine Word or Wisdom, and the Father as Divine Love, were one; a unity which is represented by a Divine *Marriage*. On the other hand, if the truth that He spoke He had spoken *apart* from the Divine Love, He would have been apart from the Father, and hence *alone* : thus He would have been *alone* in the sense of the marriage between the Humanity and Divinity, thus between Divine Love and Divine Truth, being dissolved : therefore He says, “I am not *alone*, for the Father is with me :”—“I and the Father are one.” In a corre-

\* John xiv. 10.

† Ibid., xvi. 32.

‡ Ibid., viii. 28.

According to the apostle says, "Faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being *alone*."

The term *alone*, then, is taken in the Scriptures both in a good sense and in a bad sense. If we take it in a good sense, the Adamic Church no longer regarded it as a good to be *alone*; no longer esteemed good to be a good. This is the true sense, and manifests the first symptom of a decline. On the other hand—

If we take the term *alone* in a bad sense, it is usually clear that, in this case, it was not good for a man to be *alone*. In either case, the Divine providence is exercised to remedy, as far as possible, this state of things. The remedy is thus described, "I will make him a help meet for him."

In explaining this subject we observe, that when man was created, "*male and female created he them*." Now that in every human being there exist both a masculine and feminine principle, is the doctrine of St. Augustine. When, says he,\* it is said that man was made after the image of God, this is spoken of the interior man, in which reside reason and intellect.

It was in virtue of these that man is described as having power over the whole animal creation; and that he could exercise this power over the animal kingdom without, so he could also over the animal kingdom within. This animal part of man, comprehending all the natural appetites and desires, is to the rational part of man what the woman is to the man. Hence it is that the rational mind, as being ruler, is called the male or masculine; while the animal

\* *De Genesi contra Manichæos*, lib. ii., art. 15.

man, as being obedient or passive, is called the female or feminine; in other words, the internal man is masculine, the external feminine. It is under the relation of these two that the narrative proceeds to speak of the state of man immediately before the Fall;\* concerning which St. Augustine remarks:—

“ ‘*In the day that ye eat thereof ye shall surely die;*’ after this admonition, it begins to be explained how it is that the woman is made, and she is said to be made for the help of the man; in order that, by spiritual copulation, she might bring forth spiritual progeny, *i.e.*, good works to the glory of God. When the man rules, the woman obeys; the man himself is ruled by Wisdom, the woman by the man. For the head of the man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man. And therefore it is said, ‘It is not good that man should be alone.’ Down to this time he was alone; and to this end, that not only might the soul rule over the body, inasmuch as the body occupies the place of servant to the soul, but also that the *masculine reason* might subjugate to itself the animal part by whose help he might rule over the body also. It was to exemplify this circumstance, that the woman was made, whom the order of things requires to be subject to the man; so that what in *two* human beings, *i.e.*, the male and the female, appears very evident, might be contemplated also in *one* individual being; so that the *interior mind*, as being the *masculine reason*, might hold in subjection to itself the appetite of the soul, by means of which appetite we are moved to operate with the members of the body; and might also, by a just law, impose a limit upon its helper; even as the man ought to rule the woman, nor permit the woman to rule over the man, which, wherever it occurs, perverts the home and makes it miserable.”

\* See our *Appendix*.

These relations of the *interior* man as *male*, and the *exterior* as *female*, being thus explained, St. Augustine proceeds to remark upon the *conjugal relation* between the two:—

"The\* very knowledge itself by which we understand that there is in us one thing which *rules* by reason, another which is *obedient* to reason—this very knowledge, I say, is, as it were, making of the woman out of the rib of the man; on account of its signifying (a state of subordination and hence) *conjunction* between the two. Moreover, in order that every man may rightly exercise dominion over this part of his being, and become as it were *conjugal in himself*, so that the flesh may not lust against the spirit, but be subject to it, *i.e.*, that the concupiscence of the flesh may not be in opposition to reason, but may rather cease to be carnal by being obedient to reason; he has need of perfect wisdom."

So St. Ambrose† observes, that in the law of Moses, by the *male* to be circumcised is signified the *dominant mind*. And Origen,‡ speaking of the Egyptian midwives, who, contrary to the command of Pharaoh, saved the male children alive, says, that by the *male* is meant the *interior man*. Philo also§ presents the operations of the mind as both male and female; and Moses as implying the same, when speaking of that part of the mind which is *dominant* and that which is *subject*. "The mind," says he, conceives and is in travail, and brings forth many things; but of the ideas which are brought forth by the mind some are male and some are female." In general, he regards the dominant faculties as male,

\* *Ibid.*, art. xvi.

† *De Abrahamo*, cap. xi.

‡ *Hom.* ii., Exod.

§ *On the Sacrifices of Cain and Abel*, art. 31, 34.

and the subject as female. Hence also upon the words, "Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this *generation*," Rupertus\* observes:—

"In like manner as carnal generation is effected by the conjunction of man and woman, so is spiritual generation effected by the conjunction of the *reason* and the *sensitive* part of the soul; and if reason yields to the senses, then is Cain begotten, that is, sin: but if the senses yield to the reason, then is Abel begotten, that is, good works, which are slain by Cain; because good works are destroyed by mortal sin."

The same kind of expression, founded upon the same general method of contemplating the human mind, prevails throughout the Scriptures. Thus it is said,—“They† *conceive* mischief, and *bring forth* iniquity.”—“When‡ lust hath *conceived*, it *bringeth forth* sin.”—“Behold§ he *travaileth* with iniquity, and hath *conceived* mischief, and *brought forth* falsehood.”—Moreover|| the woman representing the Church is spoken of as being with child, *travailing* in birth, and being pained to be delivered; and the child brought forth is said to be a *male*, *i.e.*, as generally interpreted, the *truth* or *doctrine* of the Church.

Indeed it is upon this view of the human mind that the whole doctrine of spiritual generation, commonly called regeneration, is founded. Accordingly¶ Swedenborg affirms, that the Most Ancient Church

\* *De Gloria Filii Hominis*, i. See *Lauretus*, art. *Generare*.

† *Isaiah* lix. 4.

‡ *James* i. 15.

§. *Psalms* vii. 14.

|| *Apoc.* xii. 2. 5. See *Isaiah* xxvi. 18.

¶ *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 54.

led the understanding in the spiritual man *male*, and will *female*, and their conjunction a *marriage*.\* Thus in the three divisions of man into spirit, soul, and body, the interior man is the spirit, the exterior man is the soul and body. Accordingly, a modern writer observes,† that "the difference between spirit and soul coincides entirely with that between *man* and *woman*; that both live in a *connubium*; that the spirit of man is, as it were, the husband of the soul."

We may hence perceive why it is that, according to Augustine, the narrative in Genesis treats of an *interior* and *exterior* man, and of the relations between the two, under the names of *man* and *woman*: the woman being regarded as the help of the man, or the *exterior* man as the *help* of the *interior*, i.e., as the instrument by which he is enabled to bring out his affections and thoughts into their ultimate effects. The harmony between the interior man and the exterior had become interrupted: for man had ceased to become, as Augustine says, *conjugal in himself*.

We have thus no difficulty in perceiving that changes in the state of the human mind, i.e., in the state of the Church, may be represented under the relations of *male* and *female* set forth in a historical form. The change at present represented in the narrative is

\* See Harris' *Hermes*, chap. iv. On the origin of *Genders* in *Genesis*.

† Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychol.*, p. 69. See the *Commentary* of Dr. Delitzsch (vol. i., p. 107), who, however, being an extreme literalist, does not accept the distinction.



that of the gradual tendency of the internal man toward the external; and the gradual predominance of the external over the internal. The consequence is, the gradual loss of the true distinction between the two; so that in due time the perceptions of Adam were mostly in the external mind; and the Providence of the Lord is now exercised in so preparing the external mind that it shall not lead to man's immediate downfall, but be a help meet for him. Accordingly, the Lord provides that this new external state of man shall be a state of external innocency; and this external innocency is preserved by causing man to receive apparent truths, instead of real truths. For, had he been permitted to retain that knowledge which is represented by giving names to every living creature, his fall would have been immediate and hopeless. It is therefore said, "I will make him a help meet for him."

The original expression is "a help *as* before him," or "a help *as* with him." This particle *as*, the meaning of which is too often here overlooked, has a deep significancy. The\* Hebrew doctors regard it as a note of similitude, and frequently use the Hebrew term here employed to denote *similitude*; as when they say, the law speaks after the manner of (*as*, or *like as*) the sons of men. It signifies also a corresponding opposite, as in the case of a strophe and antistrophe. In the present case it signifies a help *like* that which the man had before, and yet not it originally and really, but only *apparently*. In this sense it signifies an *apparent* help corresponding to,

\* See Poole's *Synopsis in loc.*

but not itself, the *real* help which the man before possessed. In conformity, therefore, with our previous interpretations, the man himself or the Church now substituted an *apparent help* for a *real help*, and thus had lost the power of making real distinctions. The Church fell into a state in which it mistook *appearances* for *realities*, because of a change in its powers of perception. The basis of all perception is love: this love became changed by passing from things internal to things external, and loving external things as a man loves his wife; so that in the love of external things was presented a certain form of *self-love*, and the Church thus became an *alter ego* or another Church.

Thus the Apostle says,\* "He that loveth his wife, loveth himself."—"Let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as *himself*;" that is, says a Commentator,† *Quia illa est alter Ego*. So another Commentator‡ observes, that the Apostle exhorts the Ephesians to love their wives as themselves; for by loving and cherishing their wives they love themselves, since their wives are their *second selves*. Again, another Commentator:§ "Christ's tender regard to us as the dear members of His spiritual body shews every husband to treat his wife as a *second self*; convincing him by the dictates of *self-love* to be kind and gentle towards her, and how unnatural it would be to do otherwise." Indeed Bishop Patrick represents Adam as saying to Eve,

\* *Ephesians* v. 28, 33.

† Zanchius *in loc.*

‡ Bloomfield's *Recensio Synoptica*.

§ Pyle's *Paraphrase*, *Ephes.* v. 28.

“Now indeed I have found what I could not see before among all God’s creatures—*another self*.”

The narrative, therefore, in Genesis now proceeds to speak of a *second self* belonging to the Church, an *alter ego* in place of the former. Before, however, this new state is superinduced, Adam is led to reflect on that state to which he had hitherto attained by the Divine help.

19. “*And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof.*”

20. “*And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field.*”

In the first chapter, at the creation of man, it is said—“Let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the face of the earth;” on which passage Augustine observes:—

“That\* is, by means of a sound intellect; from which it is manifest, that man rules over all these animals by reason. The passage may, nevertheless, be rightly understood in a spiritual sense also; so that all those affections and motions of the mind which we possess alike with these animals, we should hold in subjection, and rule over by temperance and moderation. For when these motions are not overruled, they break forth and proceed onward to the foulest habits, and carry us away by diverse pernicious delights, and make us resemble every kind of beast. But when they are overruled and kept in subjection, then they grow gentle, and live in harmony with us. For the motions of our natural mind are

\* *De Genesi contra Manichæos*, lib. i., art. 31.

not alien from ourselves; for together with ourselves they are nourished by the knowledge furnished by the truths of reason, and of sound morals, and of eternal life; as by herbs that give seed, and fruit-bearing trees, and verdant grass. This it is which is the blessed and peaceful life of man, when all these motions are conformable to reason and truth; and then they are called joys and loves that are holy, chaste, and good. But if they are not conformable, and are negligently treated, they distract and dissipate the mind, and make life most miserable; in which case they are called perturbations, and lusts, and evil concupiscences; concerning which we are commanded to strive as much as possible to crucify them in ourselves, till death be swallowed up in victory; for as the Apostle says—"They that are Jesus Christ's have crucified the flesh with its perturbations and lusts."

St. Ambrose suggests a similar interpretation. From these remarks of St. Augustine it is evident, that by *animals* he understood the affections and appetites of the natural mind. But we know that in Scripture they are also taken to signify those of the spiritual mind; as in the case of the lamb, the dove, the eagle, the calf, the lion, and so forth. We are, therefore, to understand from this verse, that Adam knew all the qualities of the internal and external mind. That it is of the utmost importance that this should be understood, will be seen in the sequel. We have already observed, that to *call by name*, signifies to designate the nature and quality. Thus in *Isaiah* :\* "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number: He *calleth them all by names* by the greatness of His might." So in the *Psalms* :† "He

\* Chap. xl. 26.

† cxlvii. 4.

telleth the number of the stars: He *calleth them all by their names.*" Again in *Isaiah* :\* "O Israel, fear not, for I have redeemed thee; I have *called thee by thy name*, thou art mine." So again:† "Thou shalt be *called by a new name*, which the mouth of the Lord shall name;"—in all which cases is designated *quality*, as where it is said, "His *name shall be called JESUS*, for He shall save His people from their sins." A *new name* signifies a new state, new quality, or a new nature.

Here, then, it is seen that the Church was in actual possession of genuine knowledge, and did not decline into her subsequent state in consequence of spiritual gifts being withheld. For, as *beasts* signify affections, *fowls of the air* exalted thoughts, etc.; so the Church was in possession of the celestial knowledge of the affections of love, and the truths of wisdom.

"But for the man there was not found a help as with him." This celestial knowledge no longer found a correspondence in the external man: the two were unsuited: even the very internal man inclines to a change. We now come, therefore, to the process by which a *new Egoity* is formed in the Church; or by which the Church becomes another.

21. "And Jehovah God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh in the place thereof."

It is here stated, that the Lord caused a deep sleep to fall upon the Church. The term *sleep*, like other terms in Scripture, may be taken either

\* Chap. xliii. 1.

† Chap. lxii. 2.

in a good sense, or in a bad sense. It is taken in a good sense when, as in the case of Jacob, he laid himself down to *sleep*, and in a dream beheld a ladder reaching to heaven, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon it; for, in this case, it is the external faculties which are laid asleep, while the internal are wakeful and active. It is commonly thought that the sleep of Adam was of this nature: that consequently Adam was on this occasion an ecstatic, and that in this ecstasy he saw visions of God, and received supernatural instruction concerning the relations between himself and his partner.

On the other hand, it is certain that *sleep* may be understood in a bad sense; as where it implies the slumber of the spiritual faculties, and the wakefulness of the natural. Thus "when the sun was going down, a *deep sleep* fell upon Abraham, and lo! a horror of great darkness;" prophetic of the obscurity in which his posterity would be in regard to spiritual things. So again it is written,\* "For the Lord hath poured out upon you the spirit of *deep sleep*, and hath closed your eyes: the prophets and your rulers, the seers hath He covered." So again,† "Awake thou that  *sleepest*, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." And again,‡ "They that *sleep, sleep* in the night." Our Saviour also describing the last state of the Church, observes, "While§ the bridegroom tarried, they all *slumbered* and *slept*." By a *deep sleep*, then, is signified a state of great obscurity with regard to the perception of

\* *Isaiah* xxix. 10.

‡ *1 Thess.* v. 7.

† *Ephesians* v. 14.

§ *Matthew* xxv. 5.

heavenly truths; out of which obscurity the Church is raised by the creation of *another selfhood*, an ALTER EGO—a process described as follows,—“*He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof.*”

“From the very text itself, and from the context,” says Cajetan, “I am compelled to understand this production of the woman, not in the sense of the letter, but as a *mystery*, related not in the way of allegory, but of parable. If the text which says that a rib was taken from out of Adam be understood in the literal sense, we run into an inevitable absurdity; such as that Adam was a monstrosity before the rib was taken from him; and that after it was taken from him, his frame was defective; both of which things are manifestly absurd: and yet that nothing absurd ought to be asserted of things at their first production is confessed by every one.

“The context likewise insinuates the same idea, viz., that the narrative is designed as a mystery. For to bring the animals before Adam, and for him not to find among them a help corresponding to his wants, if understood in the literal sense, would shew the inquiry to be ridiculous: for could any doubt possibly enter into his mind, whether any help corresponding to Adam himself could be found among birds?”

Accordingly Swedenborg says, that “it requires but small attention in any one to discern that woman was not literally formed out of the rib of a man;” and that when it is said,—“it is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a help as with him;” and when presently beasts and birds are spoken of, which nevertheless had been before mentioned, and the same thing is repeated, that “for man there was not found a help as with him,”—the connection of

the two statements implies, that "when it was given him to know his nature and quality as to the affections of goodness and the knowledges of truth, he still inclined to self-love or proprium."

On this subject Augustine observes:—

"The place indeed of the *rib* he filled up with *flesh*, that by this word *flesh* might be intimated that affection of love with which every one loves his own soul, and is not *hard* enough to despise it; for every one is disposed to love that over which he presides. For, in this passage, the *flesh* is not so called to signify carnal concupiscence; but it has rather the sense in which the prophet speaks, when he says, that the *stony* heart shall be taken away from the people, and a heart of *flesh* shall be given them. For in the same manner also the Apostle speaks, 'Not in tables of stone, but in *fleshy* tables of the heart.' For the proper sense of an expression is one thing, its figurative sense another, which is that of which we now treat. Wherefore even though it were an historical fact, that it was a visible woman who was at first made by the Lord God out of the body of the man; still, she was not so made without a reason, namely, with a view to signify some hidden truth. For can we suppose a want of mould out of which the woman might be formed? Or, if the Lord willed, might He not have taken the rib out of the man when he was awake, and this without causing pain? Whether, therefore, these things were said in figure, or done in figure, they are not so said or done without a purpose: they are obviously *mysteries* and *sacraments*, whether they be interpreted and understood after the manner which our slender ability has here attempted; or in some other and better manner, in accordance with a sound faith."

The *ribs* form the external covering of the heart and the lungs, and moreover serve to support and



protect them ; and according to Gregory the Great,\* what the *ribs* are to these internal viscera, the *senses* are to the internal thoughts. The relation, therefore, of the woman to the man is the relation of the rib to the heart and lungs, of the senses to reason, of the external mind to the internal.

22. "*And the rib which the Lord God had taken from the man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man.*"

According to the original, the expression is, not "*made* he a woman," but "*built* into a woman." The common interpretation is, that *built* has reference to a house, and a house to a home, and that the foundation upon which the home rests, is the wife. We meet, however, with a similar expression in Jeremiah,†—"Again I will *build* thee, and thou shalt be *built*, O virgin of Israel:" where the expression *build* has reference to reparation, or restoration to a former state: in the present case, to a reconstruction of the Church.

23. "*And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of the man.*"

It is expressly said, that the woman originated out of the *rib* only, *i. e.*, out of the bone of Adam, and not out of the flesh; and yet the language of Adam, "*flesh of my flesh*," literally interpreted, seems to imply that the woman was made out of his flesh also; and the common way of surmounting this difficulty is by affirming, that there was some remnant of flesh adhering to the bone. This, however, is unauthor-

\* *Liber Moral.*, xiv., cap. xviii., art. 18.      † Chap. xxxi. 4.

ized by the text, to say nothing of its absurdity. Indeed, any such supposition would disturb the spiritual sense of the narrative; besides, as we have already observed, there was no such literal transaction.

"In the first age," says Macknight,\* "neither the art of writing, nor any permanent method of conveying instruction being invented, it was necessary to make such striking actions and events as could not easily be forgotten, emblems of the instruction intended to be perpetuated."

Accordingly Adam is here represented as falling into a deep sleep; by which, as we have seen, is signified a state of unconsciousness of his former celestial life. Out of this state denominated *sleep*, he is raised into a new state of consciousness, viz., from out of natural into spiritual truth; thus out of a lower life into a higher, in the manner here described. The external or lower degree of life is represented by *bone*. When even that life is extinct, it is represented by *dry bones*.† "And he said unto me, son of man, can these *bones* live? And I answered, O Lord God, thou knowest. Again he said unto me, Prophecy upon these *bones*, and say unto them, O ye *dry bones*, hear the word of the Lord." These are the bones into which life was then to enter, and which were to be clothed with flesh—*flesh* signifying spiritual truth, and *bones* external truths into which spiritual life enters. Hence it is in a like spiritual sense that the Apostle says, "We are members of his body, of his *flesh*, and of his *bones*;"—"Inso-

\* On *Ephesians* v. 30.

† *Ezekiel* xxxvii. 3, 4.

much," says a Commentator,\* "that as Adam said to Eve, 'bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh,' so likewise in a mystical sense it may be said of us Christians, in respect of Christ, that we are of his flesh and of his bones."

"Unless," observes Macknight,† "some deep instruction were couched under the formation of Eve, what occasion was there for Adam, at his marriage with her, to declare *this now is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man; therefore shall a man leave, etc.* For although the taking of Eve out of Adam might be a reason for Adam's affection toward her, it was no reason for the affection of his posterity towards their wives, *who were not so formed.* The reason of their love to their wives is, their being creatures of the same species with themselves.‡ This Eve might have been, though, like Adam, she had been formed of the dust of the earth."

For this reason, it is argued that Adam's declaration concerning Eve's being taken out of his body, and concerning his love to her on that account, was intended for some purpose peculiar to himself. This purpose is generally considered to be the typical representation of the regeneration of believers, and of their union with Christ in heaven.

But there is a still more appropriate interpretation: according to which, even in the present day, the wife is actually formed out of the man, in the same manner as Eve. For as the whole history of

\* Dr. Wells on *Ephesians* v. 30.

† On *Ephesians* v. 30.

‡ Which the various species of the animal creation, commonly supposed to have been brought to Adam, were not. See however Cajetan's remark above.

this state of the Adamic Church is founded upon the relations between man and wife; so it is obvious, that these relations could never be assumed as the basis of a true history, unless they were founded in fact; in other words, unless they actually were of such a nature as is here described. Accordingly Swedenborg\* observes:—

"That the woman is actually formed into a wife, according to the description given in the book of Creation. In this book it is said, that the woman was created out of the man's rib; and that the man said, when she was brought to him, 'This is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh;' 'She shall be called *woman (Isha)*, because she was taken out of man (*Ish*).' By *rib of the breast*, in the Word, nothing else is signified in the spiritual sense but *natural truth*. This is signified by the *ribs* which the bear carried between his teeth, *Dan. vii. 5*; for by *bears* are signified those who read the Word in only a natural sense, and see truths therein, but without understanding. By the *breast* of man is signified, that essential and proper principle which is distinguished from the breast of woman: and that this is *wisdom*, may be seen in art. 197; for (natural) truth sustains wisdom as the rib sustains the breast: these things are signified, because the breast is that part of man in which all his principles are as in their centre. From these considerations it is evident, that the woman was created out of the man by transcription of his proper wisdom; which is the same thing as to be created out of natural truth; and that the love thereof was

\* *Conj. Love*, art. 193.

translated from the man into the woman, to the end that conjugal love might have place; and that this is done that the love of the wife, and not self-love, might be in the man. For the wife, in consequence of her innate disposition, cannot do otherwise than convert self-love, as existing with the man, into his love to herself; and this is effected by virtue of the wife's love itself, neither the man nor the wife being conscious of it. Hence it is, that no man can possibly love his wife with true conjugal love, who, from a principle of self-love, is vain and conceited of his own intelligence."

24. "*Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh.*"

In what way can this literally apply to Adam? Had he a father and a mother in the literal sense of the terms? "Therefore," says Augustine,\* "how this can refer to historical fact I am unable to discover; unless it refer to the human race in general. The whole however is a prophecy, of which the Apostle makes mention when he says, 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and cleave unto his wife. This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the Church.'"

It is remarkable, however, that St. Augustine had already discovered the key to the mystery. He had spoken of man as being *conjugal in himself*; of the interior man as masculine, and the exterior as feminine. We have only to follow up the same principle to come to a consistent interpretation of the narra-

\* *In Genesim contra Manichæos*, lib. ii., art. 19.

tive. The faculties of the mind are spoken of as *man* and *woman*, or *father* and *mother*, or *husband* and *wife*, according to the particular relations which are the subject of consideration. Now *father* and *mother*, like other terms in Scripture, may be taken both in a good sense and in a bad sense. Sometimes Truth is represented as a father. Thus St. Paul says :\* “For I have *begotten* you through the Gospel,” that is, the truth of the Gospel. So St. Peter,† —“Being born again by the Word of God ;” where the *truth* of the Word of God is *father*. “Of‡ his own will begat he us with the Word of truth,”—where *truth* is again represented as *father* ; and, in a corresponding sense, the affection which receives the truth is regarded as *mother*, and as bringing forth spiritual births. Hence the Church is represented sometimes as fulfilling one office, sometimes another, according to the different relations requiring to be described.

Occasionally the terms *father* and *mother* are taken in a bad sense ; as where it is said,§ “Ye are of your *father* the *devil*, and the lusts of your father ye will do.”—“And|| upon her forehead the name was written—Mystery ! Babylon the great, the *mother* of harlots, and abominations of the earth.”

Now that in this sense a man should leave his father and his mother may be easily admitted ; for, in this case, the lusts of Satan are the *father*, that is to say, the lusts of self-will ; and the lusts of self-

\* 1 Cor. iv. 15.

† 1 Pet. i. 23.

‡ James i. 18.

§ John viii. 44.

|| Apoc. xvii. 5.

intelligence, thus of self-righteousness, are the *mother*; and the man ought to leave these and cleave to his wife, as representing the Church.

It is obvious, however, that these are not the *father* and *mother* which were forsaken by Adam; nor could it be a father and mother in the literal sense; and yet the precept to forsake father and mother and cleave unto his wife, was, in some sense, obeyed by Adam. What then are those faculties of the mind, which, in the primeval state of innocence answered to the relations of *father* and *mother*? Clearly the will and understanding. In Adam the will was father to the thought. Hence the will was the father, the truth adjoined to the will, the mother; the thoughts hence derived, the spiritual procreations. The *self* or *egoity* derived from the father and mother is now exchanged for an *Alter Ego*: the first and inmost state of the Adamic Church, the father and mother of all succeeding Churches, is therefore now abandoned, and there is a transition to another state which is loved still more; a state lower, indeed, but still far purer than any that is reached in the present day: for though there is not the same perception of wisdom, there are yet the remains of it and also the recollection of it.

In conclusion:

We may now understand, why it is that this chapter has been said to describe a second Cosmogony: for this is undoubtedly true, if we regard the term *Cosmos* as implying the heaven and earth of the human mind. For the human mind had now arrived at a sabbatical state; and the progress of the

mind in that state is the special subject of the early part of this chapter. Hence it has not been untruly said, that\* "the consecration of the seventh day is the point upon which the whole narrative really turns, as well as the systematic division of creation into days of labor: so that in fact it appears as if the first Cosmogony itself had been described only in order to give importance to the Sabbath." Again:† "The second account," says a Hebrew commentator, "is a distinct and deliberate continuation of the first: it is intended as a *progress* in the narrative: it is not merely a detailed and specified repetition of the preceding chapter: it does not recapitulate, but it introduces new facts, and a new train of thought."

The sabbatical state is that toward which the first Cosmogony tends, and in which the second Cosmogony begins; the heaven and earth of the second Cosmogony are not, therefore, the same with the heaven and earth of the first. Hence the observation of Swedenborg, that the subject of the second chapter is the formation of the sabbatical or celestial Man.

"That‡ this formation is here treated of, is very evident from all the particulars which follow; as that no herb had as yet sprung forth; that there was no man to till the ground; also that Jehovah God formed man, and afterwards made every beast and bird of the heavens; of whose formation mention

\* *Commentary on Genesis*, by Von Bohlen, vol. ii., p. 20.

† *Historical and Critical Commentary: Genesis*. By Dr. Kalisch. Vol. i., p. 85.

‡ *Arcana Cælestia*, art. 89.



had nevertheless been made in the foregoing chapter. Wherefore it is manifest that *another man* is here treated of; and still more manifest from this circumstance, that now for the first time mention is made of JEHOVAH God; whereas, in the preceding passages which treat of the spiritual man, He is called only God. It is also further evident from hence; that now it is that mention is made of the *ground* and the *field*, whereas in the preceding passages mention is made only of *earth*: and now also in this verse heaven is first mentioned before earth, and then earth before heaven; the reason of which is, that *earth* signifies the external man, and *heaven* the internal; and that in the case of the spiritual man, reformation begins from the earth or external man; whereas in this Chapter, where the celestial man is treated of, it begins from the internal man or heaven."

The day when *Jehovah God* made the earth and the heavens was therefore the sixth day, on which that order was completed, and which terminated in the commencement of the Sabbath, on which day began the nativities of the heavens and the earth, thus of a new order of things. Now as the perceptions of the Sabbatical man are of a higher order than those which pertained to him before he had become Sabbatical, so are his thoughts concerning God necessarily of a higher order; and therefore he knows God by a different and more exalted name, that is to say, JEHOVAH God, or JEHOVAH ELOHIM; a change in his perceptions of the nature of the Divine Being, leading to a corresponding change in the Divine name. Accordingly it is universally ac-

known, that the name *Jehovah God* is a fuller expression of the Divine Being than the name *Elohim* itself.

"Abarbanel," says Bishop Horsley,\* "has given the true sense of the word *Elohim* when he says, that as the word *Jehovah* is to be expounded of the Divine Essence in itself, *Elohim*, on the other hand, is to be understood in relation to external things; that it is a name of God in respect to effect, production, creation, and influence upon all things in the universe, which receive from 'God their being, are maintained by Him in a state of well being, and in the vigor of their respective natures.'"

Hence this prelate observes that the original sense of the root of the word, is, *The Good* (τὸ Ἀγαθόν); because *Goodness* is at the root of all perfections. According to the doctrine of Swedenborg, the essence of all Divine perfections is indeed *The Good*; but this is expressed by the name *Jehovah*. Hence we read that "God† spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am *Jehovah*. And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of *God Schaddai*; but by my name *Jehovah* was I not known to them;" on which words Swedenborg says—

"From‡ the external or historical sense it may be manifest that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob did not worship *Jehovah*, but *God Schaddai*; wherefore it is said that He was known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but not by his name *Jehovah*. The reason why *Jehovah* is, nevertheless, named in the historicals concerning Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, is, be-

\* *Biblical Criticism*, vol. i., p. 25.

† *Exodus* vi. 3.

‡ *Arcana Cælestia*, art. 7194.

cause that historical word was written by Moses, to whom the name of *Jehovah* was made known, and in those historicals *Jehovah* is named *on account of the internal sense*. For, in the Word throughout, *Jehovah* is named when the subject treated of is concerning THE GOOD which is of love; whereas *God* is named when the subject treated of is concerning THE TRUTH which is of faith."

Such is the key to the otherwise mysterious interchange of names *Jehovah* and *God* in the Sacred narrative.

#### ERRATA.

In Tract No. V., p. 82, line 15 from the bottom, for "*third chapter*," read "*second chapter*."

In the present Tract, p. 13, line 5 from the bottom, erase the *full stop*.

p. 15, line 14 from the bottom, for "*alphaets*," read "*alphabets*."

p. 20, line 15 from the bottom, for "*in both*," read "*in you both*."

p. 65, line 3 from the bottom, for "*terms*" read "*opposites*."

## APPENDIX.

---

.—*Malum pœnce*.—The Lord has provided that evil  
t with its remedy, or at least its check, in punish-  
which case the evil of punishment is remedial, or  
1. In another sense; God is said to create evil,  
same principle as he is said to be angry: the Word  
commonly using *apparent* truths as the means of  
g *real* truths; there being many minds which can-  
ve *real* truths, but only those which are *apparent*.

26.—The Hebrew word TEREM, which is trans-  
our version BEFORE (*antequam*), has the meaning  
ONDUM, *not as yet*; which is a very common ren-  
the word in this passage, which will therefore read  
No shrub of the field was yet in the earth, and no  
the field had yet germinated."

36.—The *Nesama* is said to be that which man lost  
all; but there is a confusion of thought as to its  
and as to whether it pertained to the Creature or the

One writer says that, "Man was endowed with  
culties: he received a *part* of Eternal Reason." This  
istic. The Rabbins, says Bishop Bull, made a  
distinction with regard to the powers of the soul;  
tributed them into NEPHESH the *living soul*, RUACH  
t or the *rational soul*, and NESAMA the *inspiration* or  
*Natus*, which Adam received in his creation. Hence  
*ma* is said to signify some supernatural power dis-  
m and above the highest natural faculty or power in  
Dean Alford speaks of it, in *Ephesians* iv. 23, as being

in Christians "the restored and divinely informed principle of the *voûs*." This faculty, according to Swedenborg, is that of *celestial perception*, originating in the affections of the will, whereby man was enabled to contemplate, through the medium of the *voûs*, celestial things, and to see by correspondence things heavenly in things earthly. This faculty is to be fully restored to the Church, only in the time of the last Dispensation. It is of *Wisdom*, as apprehended by this faculty, that it is said, "*The first man knew her not perfectly, neither shall the last find her out; for her thoughts are more than the sea, and her counsels profounder than the great deep.*"

PAGE 39.—*Animus cujusque, is est quisque.* The common expression is, it is the *soul* which constitutes the man; but according to Scripture it is rather the *spirit*, as the *soul* properly belongs to the animal man.

PAGE 54.—I have omitted to state that the *lands* through which the rivers flowed, designate the corresponding regions of the human mind, the qualities of which, in the case of Havilah, are represented by gold and precious stones. The gold of that land is *good*, the precious stones are *truths*. The localities of the Nile and Euphrates, the two boundary rivers, are well known; but those of the two rivers which signify more interior truths, seem to have disappeared from the earth, like the truths themselves. In later ages the *Jordan* was mentioned as a boundary of Canaan: see *Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 1585, 4255.

PAGE 72.—"*In the day that YE eat thereof, YE shall surely die.*" Augustine has here followed the version of the Septuagint, in substituting the plural for the singular *number*; but it is not the common reading in this chapter.

# INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION :

BEING

A SPIRITUAL INTERPRETATION

OF

THE THIRD CHAPTER OF GENESIS :

WITH SOME REMARKS UPON THE THIRD PREFACE TO DR. LEE'S  
WORK ON INSPIRATION.

BY THE REV. AUGUSTUS CLISSOLD, M.A.,

FORMERLY OF KEMPER COLLEGE, OXFORD.


No. VII.

"It has been matter of great dispute among learned men in all ages, wherein consisted the precise notion of the Inspiration of Scripture."—*Sermons of Dr. Samuel Clarke, Rector of St. James's. Sermon 129.*

"The Divine Inspiration of Scripture consists in its internal sense; and the external sense is the Word of the Lord in the heavens."—*Swedenborg's Arcana Coelestia, 2967, 1887.*

RIVINGTONS,  
OXFORD AND LONDON.

1864.



LONDON :  
MITCHELL AND HUGHES, PRINTERS,  
WARDOUR STREET, W.

## TO THE READER.

---

IN the first number of this Series,\* published in the year 1861, it was asked,—“Can the preacher† maintain the principles of Inspiration and Interpretation which he has maintained, and the Canon as it now stands? We predict he will find that he cannot, or that others will do so. Either he must lower his ideas of Inspiration in order to include all the Canonical books, or he must exclude from the Canon certain books in order that it may answer to his ideas of Inspiration. Let him succeed, as we hope he will, in establishing the general principles he advocates, and immediately a controversy with regard to the Canon will be the result.”

Accordingly in the year 1864, a Select Preacher,‡ in a Sermon preached from the pulpit of the same University, and published by request, thus addresses the University:—

“As long as the enquiring spirit and the desire for truth subsist in the mind, uncertainties within wider or narrower limits must call for a solution. Men will discuss the claims of this or that book or chapter, for example, to a place in the sacred Canon; and it is all important not that the question should be stifled, and the difficulty thrust aside as though it

\* Page 41.

† Rev. J. W. Burgon.

‡ W. Kitchen, M.A., Junior Proctor, etc., p. 21.



were a sin, but that each point should be treated reverently, calmly, fairly."

We thus see that a discussion has been raised with respect to the Canon—a discussion which is but the fulfilment of a prediction uttered in the year 1831 in the *Oxford Tracts for the Times*, that a battle for the Canon was then impending. Nor need we wonder at the prediction; for in a work on the Canon,\* printed at the Clarendon Press at Oxford, A.D. 1798, that is, upwards of sixty years ago, it was stated,—“It is not so easy a matter as is commonly imagined, rightly to settle the Canon of the New Testament. For my own part I declare with many learned men, that in the whole compass of learning I know no question involved with more intricacies and perplexing difficulties than this.”

Indeed, a discussion concerning the Canon is only the natural result of the Reformation. Writers in the Roman Communion have always been aware of this; for as the Canon had been founded on the authority of the Church, so to call in question that authority was, in their opinion, to undermine the Canon: hence Dr. Milner, in his *End of Controversy*, asks his opponent—“By what† means have you learned what is the Canon of Scripture, that is to say, which are the books written by Divine inspiration, or indeed that any books at all have been so written?”

The Canon of Scripture is here regarded as consisting of certain books written by Divine inspiration: but what shall we say concerning this Divine Inspiration?

\* By the Rev. J. Jones.

† Letter 13.

The following are the answers to this question :—

“ I was in nowise called upon to attempt any definition of inspiration,” says the Archbishop of Canterbury in his Pastoral Letter, “ seeing that the Church has not thought fit to describe one.”

“ The Church has laid down,” says the Archbishop of Cork in his Pastoral Letter, “ no theory of Inspiration ; she has always had in her bosom teachers of at least two different theories.”

“ We heartily concur with the majority of our opponents,” says the *Aids to Faith*,\* “ in rejecting all theories of Inspiration.”

“ Let us beware,” says Mr. Burgon,† “ how we commit ourselves to any theories of Inspiration whatever.”

“ Our‡ Church,” says the Bishop of St. David’s, “ has never attempted to determine the nature of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture.”

“ If§ you ask me,” says the present Bishop of Calcutta, “ for a precise theory of inspiration, I confess that I can only urge you to repudiate all theories, to apply to theology the maxim which guided Newton in philosophy, *hypotheses non fingo*, and to rest your teaching upon the facts which God has made known to us.”

“ It|| must be borne in mind,” says the *Quarterly Review*, “ that the Church Universal has never given any definition of Inspiration.”

How then does the case stand? The Church is unable to give any definition of Inspiration, or to determine its nature ; and all theories of Inspiration

\* Page 404. † *Pastoral Office*, p. 58.

‡ See his *Charge* for 1863. Page 107.

§ *Charge* of the Bishop of Calcutta, 1863. Page 69.

|| April, 1864. Page 560.

are to be rejected. If the matter had rested here the Church would have been consistent; but says the *Oxford Declaration*, the Catholic Church "maintain without reserve or qualification, the Inspiration and Divine authority of the whole Canonical Scriptures. Have we not here an apt illustration of Locke's remarks\* upon the abuse of words?—

"Men take the words they find in use among their neighbors; and that they may not seem ignorant what they stand for, use them confidently without much troubling their heads about a certain fixed meaning; whereby, besides the ease of it, they obtain this advantage, that as in such discourses they seldom are in the right, so they are as seldom to be convinced that they are in the wrong; it being all one to go about to draw men out of their mistakes, who have no settled notions, as to dispossess a vagrant of his habitation, who has no settled abode."

If we cannot say what Inspiration is, how can we say that this or that book of the Canon, or this or that passage, is inspired? The answer may be, We know it on the authority, or on the testimony of the Church. But the question is further asked, On what grounds was this testimony given? The Catholic Church is saying to itself, 'It is true that I formerly ruled that such and such writings should form part of the Canon, but what are the grounds upon which I did so?' In answer to this question it has been thought by some, that the Church received them not on the ground of their inspiration, but on that of their Divine authority; so that if the Divine authority of certain books be established, their inspiration becomes

\* *Essay on the Human Understanding*, book ii., chap. x., 4.

a secondary question; for then their Inspiration will rest upon their authority, and not their authority upon their Inspiration. Indeed, it has been doubted whether, in this case, we might not dispense with the vexed question of Inspiration altogether; the Canon being said to be founded on the testimony of the sacred writers themselves, and the testimony of the Church; for the extent of the Canon is stated to have been virtually settled by common usage, whence the testimony of Christians became that of the Church.

Suppose now that the Epistles of St. Paul be acknowledged by the Church as being, apart from the question of Inspiration, writings of Divine authority, and thus as forming part of the Canon; on this very ground the question of Divine inspiration becomes one of supreme importance; for now on Divine authority it is stated that,—“All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” It is, then, the Divine Inspiration of Scripture which makes it profitable for these ends: and hence the Apostle inseparably unites the *inspiration* of the writings with *religious truth*; as, first, with the truths of the Christian faith; secondly, with the refutation of errors contrary to it; thirdly, with the correction of morals; fourthly, with instruction in righteousness. Now can all this be done without any reference to *religious truth*? Surely in this case, if there are whole books, or parts of books, in our present Canon, which have no relation to any *religious truth*, how can

we say that they are inspired by God, unless we contradict the Apostle and say, that all Scripture which is given by inspiration of God, is not necessarily related to religious truth? For the Apostle does not say that the Sacred writers were inspired by God with a view to guarantee the truth of the historical fact; but that the very writing, the historical fact itself as forming a part of inspired Scripture, has a distinct relation to *religious truth*. Nor are we justified in these cases in transferring the inspiration from the writing to the writer, and saying that the writer was inspired and the writing not; or, as the *Quarterly Review*\* has recently affirmed, that "it was, properly speaking, the writers who were inspired and not the Book;" for St. Paul distinctly predicates inspiration of the *Scripture* or the *writing itself*, and hence Bengel observes,—"*Scriptura Divinitus inspirata est, non solum dum scripta est, Deo spirante per scriptores; sed etiam dum legitur, Deo spirante per scripturam, et scriptura ipsum spirante?*"

It is in vain to say then that certain Books or parts of Books may be of Divine authority, although they possess no Divine Inspiration; for unquestionably the Apostle connects Divine authority with Divine Inspiration, and *Divine inspiration* with *religious truth*. It is in vain, moreover, to speak of historical records as of Divine authority, but having no relation to religious truth; and equally in vain to speak of Divine Inspiration giving rise to a Divine authority which teaches no religious truth whatever. Historical facts, therefore, if they are of Divine authority, must

\* April, 1864, page 551. This notion is by no means uncommon.

have Divine Inspiration ; and if they have a *Divine Inspiration*, they must teach *religious truth*. Consequently, whatever books or parts of books have no relation to religious truth, are without Divine Inspiration.

This is clearly admitted by the *Quarterly Review* : \*—“It may,” says the Reviewer, “without any violation of the great dictum that God is the author of Scripture, be affirmed that there may be parts of the Canonical books, which, on subjects unconnected with religious faith or moral duty, *were not written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit*, but were left of God’s special purpose to the natural acting of the writer’s powers,”—in which passage it is clearly implied, that where there is no *religious truth*, there is no *inspiration*, and if there be no Divine Inspiration, there can be no Divine authority.

Accordingly it was stated at the trial of Dr. Colenso, that the result of the operation of the Holy Ghost upon the mind of the author of the Pentateuch, which is called inspiration, was this—“A† writing of Divine authority, revealing all *religious truth* with certainty, free from all error.” It is obvious that, in this passage, the authority is the result of inspiration, and the inspiration is connected with *religious truth*.

Have then ALL the Canonical books, and all parts of those books a relation to *religious truth* ? We are told that they have not ; and not only that they have not, but that there are parts of books, with which‡ *religious truth*, if connected, would be degraded.

\* Page 552.

† Page 308.

‡ *Charge of the Bishop of St. David’s*, 1863, p. 124.

Shall we say, then, that those parts of books with which it would be a degradation to religious truth to be united, are inspired? Shall we say, that those passages in which it would be a degradation of religious truth to be united, are nevertheless profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness? Who does not perceive that this cannot be; and that we must regard certain parts of the Scriptures either as uninspired, or else as containing a spiritual sense?

So in regard to ordinary historical facts in Scripture,—do they contain within them *religious truth*? If they do not, where is the *inspiration*? Divine Truth comes from God out of heaven: is this the case with mere historical fact? The mere circumstance that the Spirit of Truth, operating upon the writer, leads him to state an historical fact as it took place, does not raise it above the level of historical facts, or change the nature of the fact itself. It still remains just what it was, the very same which it would have been if stated correctly by the unassisted memory, viz., absolutely uninspired. If, on the other hand, the fact has any religious truth, *i.e.*, any internal meaning contained within it, to what can it be owing but to Divine inspiration?

Of course it is open to any one to proceed upon the principles of Bishop Marsh, and to deny any internal sense to Scripture in general; but it is obvious that in so doing he is denying also the existence of Divine inspiration: and it is of no use to plead the Divine authority of passages which are not Divinely inspired, if the authority arises out of the inspiration.

What then is this Divine Inspiration? It is the same with Divine breathing. "Not\* only are the writers of Holy Scripture moved by the Holy Ghost, but the *writing* itself, every part of the whole *writing*, is filled with the breath of God." What is this breath? Not a speechless but a speaking breath: a breath that is articulated into mental words, or thoughts, thus into truths from the Spirit of Truth. The consequence is, that every Scripture inspired by God, conveys the thoughts of God accommodated to the thoughts of man. As such God speaks to man through inspired Scriptures, and hence these Scriptures are pre-eminently THE WORD OF GOD. There will be no peace to the Church till it returns to this first principle. I say, return; because at one time the Church adopted it.

"From the fact," says a celebrated Commentator,† "that the Sacred Scriptures are *inspired* by God, Chrysostom concludes that they have profound and divine meanings, and consequently are not plain and clear to every one, but contain many arcana. Like the stream whose outer surface alone is patent, but under which lies hidden an inner and far greater abundance of waters, in which a lamb may swim, and an elephant be drowned."

It is as arising out of this Divine inspiration that a recent Bampton Lecturer observes:—

"The‡ doctrine of the spiritual sense then rests on the

\* *Lectures on the Inspiration of the Bible*, p. 10, by Dr. Wordsworth, Canon of Westminster.

† Cornelius a Lapide on 2 *Timothy* iii. 16.

‡ Dr. Hannah, Warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond, etc., p. 113.



belief, that, in the composition of Scripture, it was God himself who furnished or suggested the materials which his chosen servants, under his continued guidance, clothed in such language as their own intelligence and position prompted. The reality of the Divine element in Scripture is the truth on which the possibility of such senses must depend ; for it implies that the *res* beneath the *voces* shall be significant as well as they."

This was the origin of the saying, *Dum narrat gestum, prodit mysterium*. Now the Church upon earth subsists from the Church in heaven. There is but one and the same Lord for both ; one wisdom of God for both ; and hence one Word of God for both. The medium, therefore, of the connection of the Church on earth with the Church in heaven, is the Word of God. But what does the Church in heaven know about Jews, and Jewish rituals ? What about the new moons, the blood of bulls and of goats, the dishes, spoons, candlestick, and bowls of the temple ? What does the Church in heaven know about Bethlehem, Jerusalem, and Jericho ; the Hivites, Jebusites, and Perizzites ; the Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians, and other earthly kingdoms ? Surely if all these things did not contain within them a *religious truth* or *internal sense*, they could be of no concern to the Church in heaven, nor any medium of communication between men on earth and angels in heaven. Consequently, in so far as the Church on earth ignores this spiritual sense, it cuts itself off from the Church in heaven ; and, like the Church of Sardis, has a name to live but is dead.

Are we, however, to apply this principle of Inspira-

tion to the *whole* of the Canon? Shall we say that every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High? Certainly not; for the Apostle was alluding to the Canon as it existed in the Jewish Church, and not as it exists in the Christian; and this Canon is alluded to by the Saviour as consisting of the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, in all which there existed a spiritual sense as relating primarily to Christ, and in a secondary way to the Christian. But there is no internal sense in the Acts of the Apostles; nor any in the Epistles, though they relate to subjects which concern the internal sense. The Word of God, therefore, is an expression which applies primarily to those books in which there is an *internal sense*; and only in a secondary way to those which have not the internal sense, but treat of subjects which arise out of it; while those books which have been said to have no relation to any *religious truth*, cannot be called the Word of God in any sense whatever.

“Take,\* for instance, the Book of Esther. This book is not quoted once in the New Testament. It was not considered as Canonical by two considerable Fathers, Melito and Gregory Nazianzen. It contains no prophecy, it has nothing on the surface to distinguish it from a mere ordinary history; nay, it has no mark on the surface of its being a religious history. Not once does it mention the name of God, or Lord, or any other name by which the God of Israel is designated.”

From these remarks, then, it will be seen that an

\* Oxford *Tracts for the Times*, vol. v. *The Canon and Creed Compared*, p. 81. A.D. 1838.

*internal sense* of Scripture is essential to its *Divine Inspiration*. This we have seen plainly admitted and therefore says a recent Bampton Lecturer :\*—

“A spiritual sense then must always have lain hid beneath the letter, and must have been gradually unfolded in proportion to the elevation of the human faculties in their deepest relation to God. We must admit the existence of that spiritual sense before we can trace the successive disclosures of the ever-brightening light which penetrates the letter of God’s earlier Word. Throughout the entire range of the Old Testament Scriptures there exists a deeper signification than the literal—a signification which is veiled alike under command and precept, type and symbol, history and prophecy, stern denunciation and triumphal psalm.”

If this deeper signification exists “throughout the entire range of the Old Testament Scriptures,” and if the first Three Chapters of Genesis form a part of those Scriptures, it is high time that we should endeavour to ascertain what this deeper signification is. According to what we have stated, it must be a signification having relation to *religious truth*; for as a modern writer observes :—

“Its† purpose as inspired writ is in no degree to give us a history of cosmogenesis, a knowledge of which is certainly not material to our spiritual welfare, if it be in any respect related thereto—but solely to communicate *religious truth*. The religious truth which it embodies, is plainly, according to every interpretation of the record, truth of the very supremest importance.”

It is no other than trifling to teach these things

\* Dr. Hannah, p. 111.

† *Faith and Peace*, art. *Sacred Record of Creation*, p. 65.

and yet to deny them. The Church is shut up to the conclusion, not Yes *and* No, but Yes *or* No. Are the early Chapters of Genesis inspired? Yes or No. If they are inspired, do they for that reason teach *religious truth*? Yes or No. If they teach religious truth, what is the religious truth which they teach? What is there in them that is profitable for doctrine, or reproof, or correction, or instruction in righteousness? Shall we say that all that the first Chapter tells us is, that there is a God who made heaven and earth, and that he made them in a certain order of succession? Or shall we say that something more is taught, and that the outward Creation is a type of the inner? This at least is a truth beginning at last to be acknowledged, though but slowly, doubtfully, and timidly.

“If,” says a modern divine,\* “there is an *inward creation* which this *outward creation* typifies, illustrates, and explains; if the same God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, we need be at no loss for a clue to understand the first Chapter of Genesis in a manner profitable for our soul’s health; profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and instruction in righteousness.”

I need not say that the interpretation of the First Chapter determines the interpretation of the Second and Third; for the interpretation results from the principle of inspiration. The question of inspiration, says a modern writer, cannot be admitted to be of

\* *Four Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, by Dr. Goulburn, Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford, etc., p. 9.

no importance to the interpreter; for "will\* not a clear view of the inspiration of the Scriptures tend to direct and strengthen his conclusions respecting their interpretation?"

It has been well observed in one of the *Tracts for the Priests and the People*,† that—

"Naturalists who did not care much while we agreed with them about the story of Creation, still less while we argued with them about all the evidences of adaptation which prove an intelligent Creator, may listen to the strange news that by the Divine Word the order was made that in Him was life, and that His life is the light of men; and may find in these mystical utterances the very meaning of Creation, that which contradicts none of their discoveries, but transcends them and harmonizes them—that which shews that Moses could only understand the order of the Universe in reference to man, because he could only understand man in reference to God."

---

P.S. These remarks had passed through the press when, for the first time, I read the Preface to the third edition of *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, by William Lee, D.D., Archdeacon of Dublin, etc., recently published. As any observations upon the statement there made, respecting the doctrines of Swedenborg in their relation to *Inspiration*, would be here out of place, I have reserved them for the conclusion of the present Tract, to which therefore I invite the attention of the reader.

\* *Faith and Peace, Authority of Scripture*, by the Rev. J. Fendall, Rector of Harlton, etc., p. 45.

† *The Mote and the Beam*, by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, *Tract* ii., p. 72.

## INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION.

---

### GENESIS—CHAPTER III.

Apostle speaks of the Christian Church as  
; a Man\*—"one new man"†—"a perfect man;"  
is to say, he speaks of the Church as being  
n—one new *Adam*—a perfect *Adam*, the noun  
or *Adam* being collective; in which sense the  
Christian Church might be called an Adamic  
ch.

r Lord, moreover, is called the second Adam,†  
the Church is said to be His *body*;§ thus, "for  
*body's* sake, which is the Church,"||—"the  
ch which is His *body*"¶—"He gave some  
les . . . . for the edifying of the *body* of Christ,  
e all come unto a *perfect man*, unto the measure  
e stature of the fulness of Christ,"\*\*—"we  
many are one *body* in Christ, and every one  
ers one of another,"††—"ye are the *body* of  
t and members in particular."

is *human body*, or this *man*, is not the world in  
al, or the human race in general, or society in

\* Ephes. ii. 15.

† Ephes. iv. 13.

r. xv. 47. § Col. i. 24. || Ephes. i. 23. ¶ Ephes. iv. 12.

\*\* Rom. xii. 5.

†† Rom. xii. 27.

general; but that society which is specifically called the Church, because the principle of life, hence of organization and unity, hence of society properly so called, is in the Church. This is the view of the subject taken by the Apostle. The Church, however, was not destined to arrive at a perfect humanity, or Adamic nature, till the last dispensation, when there were to be new heavens and a new earth; and, as a consequence, that Paradisiacal state in which the Church would obey the commandments of God, and again be admitted to the Tree of Life.

We see then what is the meaning of the expression *Adamic Church*; and accordingly, apart from the language of the Apostle, many have selected the successive ages of the *individual man*, or of some hypothetical *universal man*, or *colossal man*, as the best exemplification of the philosophical principles of history. Florus,\* in the *proemium* to his Roman history, represents the Romans under the form of a *human being*, in his different stages from infancy to old age:

"If any one therefore," says he, "will contemplate the Roman people as a *Man*, and will note his entire age throughout, how he had his beginning, how he grew up to adolescence, how he arrived at a certain flower of youth (or maturity), and then afterwards passed on to old age, he will find four different stages and progressions."

Pascal observes† that "the whole succession of men during the course of so many ages from the

\* See Adam Clarke on Daniel, chap. ii., *Discourse on Nebuchadnezzar's Dream*.

† Bishop of St. David's *Charge*, 1863, p. 41. 2nd Ed.

beginning, ought to be considered as one and the same *Man* who is always subsisting and continually learning; whence the old age of this *universal Man* ought not to be sought for in the times near to his birth, but in those which are farthest from it."

The same idea is presented in the article on *The Education of the World* in the *Essays and Reviews*; for, after observing that each successive age incorporates into itself the substance of the preceding, the author remarks:—

"This power,\* whereby the present ever gathers into itself the results of the past, transforms the human race into a *colossal Man*, whose life reaches from the Creation to the day of Judgment. The successive generations of men are days in this *man's* life. The discoveries and inventions which characterize the different epochs of this world's history, are his works. The creeds and doctrines, the opinions and principles of the successive ages, are his thoughts. The state of society at different times are his manners. *He* grows in knowledge, in self-control, in visible size, just as we do. And his education is in the same way and for the same reason, precisely similar to ours.—All this is no figure, but only a compendious statement of a very comprehensive fact."

On the same principle Lord Bacon observest—  
"*Antiquitas sæculi juvenus mundi*. These (or the present times) are the ancient times when the world is ancient; and not those which we account ancient, *ordine retrogrado*, by a computation backward from ourselves."

We thus see that the type both of *man* and the

\* Page 3.

† *Advancement of Learning*, p. 46, Montagu's Ed. See our *Appendix*.



*human body*, is employed both by sacred and secular writers to represent the state of society; but that the sacred writers apply it to represent the Church, and secular writers mankind in general. At this point, however, commences a vast divergence. For if we regard the first state of man after he had been placed in Paradise, as constituting the infancy or the childhood of the world; and subsequent history, as that of the world's developments out of childhood into manhood, it is obvious that there is no place for the commonly received doctrine of the FALL, and hence no basis for the doctrines of Redemption, hereditary evil, regeneration, and so forth; as, indeed, is openly asserted by many who advocate this view of the subject. For in infancy and childhood the moral sense is not developed, there is no genuine knowledge of good and evil, and the information said to be generally suited to that state is that of fabulous legends and fairy tales, which is all that we can expect at so early an age.

That such a view of the subject undermines the teaching of the Church, is perfectly clear; but it is also clear, that if the state of Paradise did really constitute the infancy of the world, from out of which the world has been advancing to childhood, youth, and maturity, it is in vain to protest against the necessary consequence. Where, then, lies the error? for, unquestionably, the world has experienced its infancy. The error lies in this; that the infancy of the human race has been placed in Paradise, instead of out of it: in the garden of Eden, instead of the state of Chaos. The early history of mankind must

therefore be carried back to a period of much more remote antiquity than is usually done,—a period when the human mind is confessed to have been a *spiritual chaos*,—without form, and void, and when darkness was upon the face of the deep. At that time, indeed, the Adamic Church was not; for the human mind had yet to pass from infancy to childhood, from childhood to youth, from youth to manhood, that is, to a formation of man into the image and likeness of God. Accordingly, the constitution of a Church out of a state of *Chaos*, as described in the first chapter of Genesis, might require a much longer succession of ages than the interval between the state of Paradise and the present day.

This view of the subject has acquired a vast importance, as well as probability, from recent researches into the Antiquity of Man :

“The mind,”\* says a modern writer, “is lost in astonishment in looking back at such a vast antiquity of human beings. A tribe of men in existence hundreds of thousands of years before any of the received dates of Creation! savages who hunted with their flint-headed arrows, the gigantic elk of Ireland, and the buffalo of Germany, or who fled from the fierce tiger of France, or who trapped the immense clumsy mammoth of northern Europe. Who were they? we ask ourselves in wonder. Was there with man, as with other forms of animal life, *a long and gradual progression from the lowest condition to a higher, till at length the world was made ready for a more developed human being*, and the Creator placed the first of the present family of man upon earth?

\* *The Races of the Old World*, by Charles Brace, p. 341. See also *The Philosophy of Geology*, by David Page, F.R.S.E., F.G.S., p. 115.

Were those European barbarians of the Drift Period a Primæval race, destroyed before the creation of our own race; and lower and more barbarian than the lowest of the present inhabitants of the world? Or, as seems more probable, were these mysterious beings—the hunters of the mammoth and the aurochs—the earliest progenitors of our own family, the childish fathers of the human race?"

"The subject hardly yet admits of an exact and scientific answer. We can merely here state the probability of a vast antiquity to human beings, and of the existence of the FOSSIL or PRE-ADAMITIC MAN."

These remarks may suffice to shew the probability of a long and gradual progression from the lowest condition of human nature to a higher, *i.e.*, from a state of Chaos to a state of Paradise, or to the constitution of an Adamic Church, described, as we have already seen, in the first chapter of Genesis. Indeed a modern writer goes so far as to say,\*—"It appears, therefore, that Holy Scripture does not forbid, nay, rather that it requires, a belief in the existence of *Pre-Adamites* of our species, whose posterity was not destroyed with the unbelieving Adamites by the waters of the Deluge."

When therefore we find, as in the *Essays and Reviews*,† that the modern discovery of the *Antiquity of the human race* militates against the Divine authority of the early chapters of Genesis, we observe, that this is no discovery of modern Science: for more than a century since, an interpretation of these chap-

\* *The Genesis of the Earth and of Man.* By Reginald Stuart Poole, M.R.S.L., etc., of the British Museum, p. 103.

† Essay 3. *Study of the Evidences of Christianity*, p. 129.

ers was founded upon the very fact of the Antiquity of man, and the very language of the book of Genesis itself; and the writer remarked—

“It is\* believed by many persons, that Adam and Eve, mentioned in the book of Genesis, do not mean the first of the human race that were created on the earth; and in support of this opinion, they produce arguments from chronological computations found among some people and nations, which favour the existence of men prior to Adam; and also from what Cain, Adam’s first-born, said to Jehovah, *Gen. iv. 14–18*; whence they conclude that the earth was inhabited before the time of Adam. In addition to this, *I have abundantly demonstrated . . .* that Adam and his wife mean *the most ancient Church* that existed on our earth, and . . . that the garden of Eden means the wisdom of the *men of that Church*,” etc.

Upon this principle we find the philosophical, the scientific, and the biblical accounts concerning the infancy and antiquity of man all harmonize with each other; and indeed with historical traditions; as, for instance, with those furnished by Hesiod, concerning the *gold, silver, brass, and iron* ages, upon which we need not here enlarge; though it will be desirable to see whether any further light is thrown upon this part of the subject by Scripture.

Now there will be seen to be a remarkable parallelism between the metallic ages of the world as described by Hesiod, and those of the Church as described in Daniel; for in Daniel we have a repre-

\* Swedenborg’s *True Christian Religion*, art. 466. See our *Appendix*.

sensation of the "universal" or "colossal man," composed of *gold, silver, brass, iron and clay*; but the succession is one not of amelioration but of deterioration. There is in fact, in the history of the Church or "the colossal" or "universal man," a transition from *gold* down to an incoherent mixture of *iron and clay*. But if the age of Paradise was that of the childhood of the world, the order ought to be inverted; and the head of the image should be of *iron and clay*, representing the sensuous, earthly, and incoherent knowledges of that period. Then would follow not a *fall* into a lower condition (for a lower there could not be), but a *rise* into a higher, represented by *brass*; then a rise into a still higher, represented by *silver*, and finally we should reach the age of *gold*. We might thus dispense with the doctrine of the FALL altogether, and with all the doctrines of Christianity founded upon it: for now we must regard the *Fall* as only the first effort to *rise*, and consequently must turn the foundation of Christianity, and the doctrines which are built upon it, upside down.

Accordingly, there is a strong tendency in the present day to effect this purpose:

"Man's previous state," (says a Select Preacher\* from the University pulpit, referring to the state in Paradise,) "happier though it may have been in a sense, was clearly a *lower* state than his present condition. In it he had dominion over the lower creatures, had language, social comforts, power of improvement; for he was set to till the ground; but there he stopped. Not till he had found his way to the knowledge of

\* Rev. G. W. Kitchin, M.A., *Junior Proctor*.

good and evil, did he become 'as one of us;' and even in spite of the *Fall* win a place in a *higher* rank, with *higher* hopes, and a desire to take of that other fruit, and so to live for ever."

Again :

"The age of *iron*" (says another modern writer) "was never consciously felt except in connection with an anticipated *golden* one, and the deeply deplored '*Fall*' was only the first mental symptom of the effort to *rise*."\*

We must beware, then, how we regard the *human body*, or *man*, or *Adam*, as representing only the kingdoms of this world, as we find so generally the case; for, as we have seen, the Apostle certainly did not apply them to the kingdoms of this world but to the Church; it is, therefore, in its application to the Church that we proceed to consider the dream of Nebuchadnezzar.

"Thou,† O king, sawest, and behold A GREAT IMAGE, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee, and the form thereof was terrible. This image's head was of fine *gold*, his breast and his arms of *silver*, his belly and his thighs of *brass*, his legs of *iron*, his feet part of *iron*, part of *clay*."

This *great image*, as we have stated, is the "colossal" or "universal man," representing the Church. Let us now see what has been said upon this subject.

In general, when the golden age has been identified with that of Paradise, it has been identified also with that of the Church; for it would have been absurd to speak of it as representing merely the political condition of our first parents; and consistency re-

\* Mackay's *Tübingen School*, p. 64.

† *Daniel* ii. 31.

quires, that the same application to the Church should be extended throughout the whole succession of metallic ages.

"The most ancient people," says Swedenborg,\* "compared the principles of goodness and truth in man, to *metals*; the inmost or celestial goodness relating to love to the Lord, to *gold*; the truths thence derived, to *silver*; inferior or natural goods, to *brass*; and inferior truths, to *iron*. Nor did they only use such comparisons, but they also called the things signified, by the names of the metals whereby they were signified. Hence periods of time also were likened to the same metals, and were called the *golden*, the *silver*, the *brazen*, and the *iron* ages. The *Golden* age was the time of the Most Ancient Church, which was a celestial man. The *Silver* age was the time of the Ancient Church, which was a spiritual man. The age of *Brass* was the time of the succeeding Church; which was followed by the age of *Iron*. The like is signified by the statue which Nebuchadnezzar saw in a dream, whose head was of fine *gold*, his breast and arms of *silver*, his belly and thighs of *brass*, his legs of *iron*. That the periods of the Church were so to succeed or did so succeed, appears in the same chapter in the same prophet. That *silver* in the internal sense of the Word wherever it occurs, signifies truth and in an opposite sense the false, appears from the following passages: 'For *brass* I will bring *gold*, for *iron* I will bring *silver*, and for wood *brass*, and for stone *iron*, and I will make thy officers peace, and thine exactors righteousness;' where it is evident what

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, 1551; also 10,355.

is signified by every metal. The subject there treated of is the coming of the Lord, and His celestial kingdom and church. *Gold* for *brass*, denotes celestial good instead of natural good : *silver* for *iron*, denotes spiritual truth instead of natural truth : *brass* for wood, denotes natural good instead of corporeal good : *iron* for stones, denotes natural truth instead of sensual truth.”\*

From these remarks we may see not only the order of declension but the nature of it, viz., from *gold* to *silver*, from the will to the intellect, or from goodness to truth ; from *silver* to *brass*, or from the knowledge of spiritual truth to natural good ; from *brass* to *iron and clay*, or from natural good to an incoherent mixture of natural truth and sensuous truth ; the whole “colossal” or “universal man” being finally to be broken in pieces by the stone cut out of the mountain. Now we need not suppose the transition from one metal to another, as of *gold* to *silver*, to be sudden or abrupt ; for the gold may become dim, and the most fine gold changed ; and the silver may become dross ; and the fine brass tarnished, and the iron become mixed with impurities, gradually. We have already seen some of the phases of declension through which the golden age passed ; as *first*, when the Church was in the highest state of purity in Paradise ; *secondly*, when it no longer wished to be *alone*, or separated internally, as were the Jews externally, from surrounding nations ; and when consequently the unity of its being represented by *Adam*, or *homo*, became separated into two principles, the

\* See our *Appendix*.



external masculine reason or *vir*, and the feminine affection or *mulier*; and yet these two principles became conjoined in harmony with each other, and the Church abode still in innocence, actual guilt being as yet unknown.

We now proceed to shew how even this state of unity began to decline; and how the *two* harmonizing principles, the *man* and the *woman*, began to resolve themselves into *three*, the *man*, the *woman*, and the *serpent*. In order, however, to explain this *third* phase of the Adamic Church, we must first have recourse to the psychology of Scripture.

According to this psychology, man himself is distinguished into two components, the *outward man* and the *inward man*, or the *external man* and the *internal man*. Thus the Apostle says,—“Though\* our *outward man* perish, yet the *inward man* is renewed day by day”—“Being† strengthened with might—in the *inner man*,”—“I‡ delight in the law of God after the *inward man*, but I see another law in my members,” *viz.*, in the *outward man*. Elsewhere the Apostle calls the inner man the *spiritual man*, the outward man the *natural man*; hence he observes, “the§ *natural man* receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned;” *i.e.*, they can be examined and understood only by spiritual illumination. Πνεῦμα is here the inward man, or the rational mind enlightened by the Spirit of God; ψυχή the outward man unen-

\* 2 Cor. iv. 16.

† Ephes. iii. 16.

‡ Rom. vii. 22.

§ 1 Cor. ii. 14.

lightened by the Spirit of God. Now as the outward and inward man are thus distinguished from each other, so is the way of access to each. The way to the outward man is outward, that is, from the outward world, through the outward senses, to the rational faculty. In this case the rational mind is built up on the foundation of the senses; on what the eye hath seen, and the ear hath heard, and the heart of man hath conceived; and the knowledge thus obtained, which in the world passes for wisdom, may be called the wisdom of this world, as being derived from the things of time and space, hence from what is commonly called Nature.

On the other hand, the way to the rational faculty of the *spiritual* man is altogether distinct, and indeed opposite to the other; for instead of leading from without to within, it leads from within to without; hence, according to the Apostle, the light which the inner man receives comes not from the outer man, or the outer world, but from the inner man who receives it from the Spirit of God; and therefore the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him, says the Apostle, "God hath revealed to us by his Spirit." In this case, when the rational faculty of the outward man reasons concerning spiritual things, it reasons from the intuitions of the inner or spiritual man, which intuitions are so many first principles. On the other hand, when the merely natural man reasons concerning spiritual things, there being no inner or spiritual man, he has no such intuitions; hence he has nothing to direct him to any conclusions, and the whole argument of

the spiritual man seems to him the baseless fabric of a vision, or as ever taking for granted things which require to be proved.

Now we have shewn, on a former occasion, how the intuitions of the inner man were created; how the outward man was afterwards brought into harmony with the inward, and how consequently the very outward man became a living soul, living and breathing from the inward. This life was the angelic life of man in Paradise, in consequence of which he had intercourse with angels, was endowed with angelic wisdom, and from this wisdom had an insight into the secrets of Nature. This order of thought corresponded to what is now called *synthetic*, in which we proceed from ends to causes, from causes to effects, from first principles to conclusions. On the contrary, the natural man proceeds, in natural science, by the analytical method, from effects to causes, from particular instances, by induction from observation and experiment, to general principles.

Apply this method of observation and experiment to the Adamic Church, and we must conclude that so far from that Church being endowed with the most exalted wisdom, it must have been in possession only of the fairy tales of childhood. Thus—

“To\* the earliest ancestors of the human race the world must have been an almost unintelligible riddle. In the dark abyss of time man began, unaided and undisciplined, to make those guesses at truth which he has continued to make ever since. The first explanation of Nature was inevitably incorrect and fictitious. Systematic observation requires

\* *Westminster Review*; January, 1864. p. 50.

time: to institute comparison or experiment argues a degree of mental enlargement which did not exist in the infancy of the race; and without observation, experiment, and comparison no true science can possibly be constructed. In the absence of real knowledge, a sham knowledge sprang up. Mankind, like children, began life with fairy tales."

If now it be admitted, that there is no other possible access to the rational faculty than through the medium of the senses, or to the *πνεῦμα* than through the medium of the *ψυχή*; and if we date the infancy of mankind from Paradise instead of Chaos, it seems impossible to come to any other conclusion. All this, however, arises from assigning a wrong date to the infancy of mankind; and from ignoring altogether the higher way leading to the intellectual faculties, the way leading not from without to within, but from within to without, or from heaven to earth.

It is, accordingly, with this higher way of acquiring wisdom that we are at present concerned. We have consequently to treat of an order of thought, which, however it may have existed in Paradise, does not exist now; and we have further to shew, how the *Fall* consisted in a descent from this order of thought into that which now prevails; which we are enabled to shew with the aid of the psychology taught by the Apostle. In the present age, the way of acquiring wisdom which existed in Paradise, would be thought miraculous; but it was not so *then*. There is a nature proper to the spiritual world, and there is a nature proper to the material world; but there are also laws proper to both, and as such there are supernatural laws as well as natural laws; but the laws

supernatural are so called only in the sense of the supernatural being *above* the natural, the heavenly nature above the earthly. Not that the two are independent of each other, but connected with each other by mutual correspondence. It is in consequence of this correspondence that we are enabled to use, as symbols, the objects of the natural world to represent the things of the spiritual world.

Now, in treating of the Adamic Church we observe, that the narrative in Genesis furnishes the history of its *inner life* : hence the history of the inner workings both of the will and intellect, which Jehovah God alone could reveal ; and therefore it may be called the Divine history of the inner life of the Church, such as He only who is the life of the Church, could reveal. If then the Tree of lives represents, as we have seen, this inmost life of the Church ; the exclusion from this Tree, and consequently from the inner life it represented, involves the order of descent from the inner life to the outward, from the inner perceptions of Divine wisdom to the outward fallacies of the senses ; consequently, from spiritual life to spiritual death. The case would have been *otherwise*, if, as some have assumed, the state of the Adamic Church was not one of angelic wisdom but of childish ignorance ; for then we should have to contemplate Paradise as a garden of the senses, and the Fall itself as the first upward movement of the human mind. To those who take this view of the subject, our present observations cannot but appear as mystical. This we cannot help. The childishness which has been attributed to the Adamic Church, we regard as not of

that age, but of this; as not of the Sacred narrative, but of its modern interpreters. Either the Adamic Church had an inward and celestial life, or it had not. If it had not, what becomes of the Fall? If it had, we are only aiming to describe what it was, how it was lost, and how it is to be regained: thus, how the Church lived, how it died, and how it was to be raised up again.

With these introductory remarks we proceed to the exposition of the Third Chapter of Genesis.

1. "*And the serpent was more subtle than any wild beast of the field which the Lord God had made.*"

When it was said, "They were both *naked* and were not ashamed," the word which is there translated *naked*, is the same with that which is here translated *subtle*. In a bad sense it signifies to be subtle and cunning: in a good sense it signifies to be prudent, sagacious, or discerning. When it signifies to be *naked* in a bad sense, it implies *guilt*; in a good sense, *innocence*. Thus the same word signifies guilt and innocence, what is good and what is evil, consequently *opposites*; and the subtlety lies in passing from one to the other without its being perceived; thus from the nakedness of innocency to the nakedness of guilt, from wisdom to cunning, from faith to unbelief, from good to evil.

So likewise the *serpent* itself has opposite meanings; for it may be taken in a good sense, and in a bad sense: it may signify the Redeemer, or it may signify the devil: it may signify *wisdom*, as when it is said, Be ye wise as serpents; or it may signify *magic* and *sorcery*. Nay, the very term *wis-*

*dom* itself is sometimes used to signify deception or cunning, as when Pharaoh said, "Let\* us deal *wisely* with the Israelites," meaning *craftily* and *cunningly*; and when it is said, that† "God taketh the *wise* in their own craftiness;" "my‡ people are *wise* to do evil;" "the *wisdom*§ of this world is *foolishness* with God;" "thy *wisdom*|| and thy knowledge it hath *perverted* thee:" "the children¶ of this world are *wiser* in their generation than the children of light.

When, according to the psychology of the Apostle, the external mind was subordinate to the internal, the Church was in the perception and discernment of *real* truths both internally and externally; but when the external mind had gained the ascendancy over the internal, the perception of real truths was lost, and in its place there succeeded the perception of only *apparent* truths, by which, nevertheless, as we have seen, the innocence of man was for a time preserved. But apparent good and truth partake of the nature of *fallacies*; and fallacies are the media which lead to *opposites*; for in this case evil is not seen as evil but as apparently good, and the false is not seen as false, but as apparently true. Fallacies therefore, as such, are themselves opposites under the appearance of not being opposites. The subtlety lies in their *appearance*, and their appearance results from our judging according to the senses; whence our Lord says, "Judge not according to *appearances*, but judge righteous judgment."

As, then, in the case of fallacies, opposites are not

\* *Erodus* i. 10. † *Job* v. 13. ‡ *Jer.* iv. 22. § 1 *Cor.* iii. 19.

|| *Isaiah* xlvii. 10.

¶ *Luke* xvi. 8.

seen to be opposites ; so likewise any transition from one opposite to the other is equally unperceived. Apparently there is no transition ; nevertheless such a transition *must* have existence ; and in the case of good and evil is effected by *intermediates* ; just as in the case of reasoning, we pass from the premises by intermediate propositions to the conclusion.

"The *intermediates* which conjoin *opposites*,"\* says Swedenborg, "are the *fallacies* of the external senses ; and also those things which are said in the Word according to *appearance*." For fallacies may be made the means of conveying truths to the apprehension, or they may be made the means of conveying falsities. They convey truths when the fallacies are the result of truth descending into the mind, and being accommodated to the state in which the mind is ; as in the case of children, and the ignorant and simple but well-disposed. On the other hand, they convey falsities when they do not proceed from truths descending into the mind and accommodated to the appearances in which the mind is ; but when they come from without, and are regarded as genuine truths apprehended by the rational faculty, and hence as convertible into first principles upon which doctrine may be founded. There is not a single religious truth which cannot be falsified, and the falsification confirmed by fallacies ; the nature of the fallacies arising from the nature of the sensuous state in which a man is, the quality of which is represented by the corresponding kind of *serpent* : thus we read of the *red dragon*, of *water serpents*, *land serpents*, *fiery*

\* *Arcana Cælestia*, art. 7344.—See our *Appendix*.



*flying serpents*, and so forth. The very same fallacies, therefore, may be innocent or sinful, according to the source from which they proceed: they may be the vehicle of religious and devotional feelings; or they may be profane, blasphemous, and diabolical.

Let us illustrate the case by examples.

The Bible says that God repents: in another place, that he is not a man that he should repent. The former is the apparent or sensuous truth, the latter the real or rational truth; and yet the apparent truth is only the real truth accommodated to the sensuous state of the mind; because the rational mind is in the inverse order of the senses. The Bible says that God is angry; this is the sensuous truth: also, that He is love itself and unchangeable; this is the rational truth; but this truth, in order to be accommodated to the sensuous mind, must be expressed in the inverse order. The Bible says that God punishes the wicked and casts them into Hell: this is the apparent truth: the rational or genuine truth is that man punishes himself and casts himself into Hell: but this truth cannot be accommodated to the external mind without assuming the inverted order in which the external mind is. The Bible says that God is pacified and reconciled to us; this is the sensuous truth: but it also says that it is we who are reconciled to God; this is the rational truth, which is accommodated to the inverse order of the sensuous mind by itself being inverted. The Bible says that God rested from his works; this is the sensuous truth: and again, that He is never weary and fainteth not; this is the rational truth. Now, the merely sensuous

mind can never accommodate itself to the rational; because by creation it is in the inverse order of the rational; for the organ of sight cannot but see the sun as setting, while the truly rational mind cannot but contemplate it as stationary. And yet the philosopher may speak of the setting of the sun; and the rational divine of God repenting, and being angry, and being reconciled, and resting from all his works; only in so doing he must remember, that he is but accommodating the truths of the rational mind, thus of manhood, to the apprehensions of the sensuous mind, thus of childhood. If otherwise, he reasons from the senses to the intellect. There is no greater mistake in theology than to confound these two, and to put forth sensuous truths as rational truths; apparent truths as real truths, and then to regard them as the foundation of a system of teaching. In this way the whole system of Christianity might be falsified, and every doctrine of Scripture misrepresented. Indeed, this is no other than interpretation by the *Serpent*; in consequence of which Christianity is converted into a mere accumulation of fallacies, hence of incoherencies and inconsistencies.

To say that God tempted Abraham, and then to say that God tempts no man, are not incommensurable propositions in any other view than that reason and the senses are incommensurable; and in this case it is not the rational mind that regards them as incommensurable, but the sensuous; for the sensuous cannot of itself adapt itself to the rational, though the rational may to the sensuous. Hence the anthropomorphisms in Scripture are only adaptations of

rational truths to the external mind. Even, however, the highest forms of truth presented to the Adamic Church in Paradise, were anthromorphic; for neither men nor angels can ever conceive the absolutely Divine. It is only through some human form that God makes known his divine thoughts to man: it is only with these human expressions of truth that man is concerned. But in the person of our Lord the human is now divine, and the divine is human. In him we cannot contemplate the human as non-divine, or the divine as non-human. He is himself the Divine human: He is no incarnate antinomy; in Him the Divine and human are not incommensurable: otherwise, the person of our Lord would be the very centre of contradictories; and every truth in his Divine mind would be contradicted in his human.

We may, then, be thankful that God has been pleased to accommodate his truths to the human mind by sensuous anthropomorphisms as long as the mind is sensuous; but when it becomes rational, these external forms of truth are resolved into rational anthropomorphisms, and are thus accommodated to the rational mind: for in the person of Christ the Divine itself is anthropomorphic. Antinomies therefore do not arise from any contradiction between the Divine and human; but between the internal and external of the human mind, in consequence of their being presented *in different planes*.

We say then with a modern writer:\*

“Now in truth there is no real opposition between these contrasted statements. To call them contradictions is a

\* *Bampton Lectures* by Dr. Hannah, p. 95.

mere *ignoratio elenchi*: they cannot contravene each other, because their movement lies in *different planes*."

But are these *different planes* unconnected with each other? No: the lower subsists from the higher, the external from the internal; and when thus rationally viewed, the external bears its testimony to the internal. For if we view a figure through what we know to be an inverting medium, we know that the position of the figure, thus seen, is inverted; and this being the case, the inverting medium bears its testimony to the real position of the figure. But if we knew not that the medium possessed this inverting power, into what errors might we not fall in arguing from the visible position as the real one? If then in any narrative it were to be affirmed in one place, that the figure was upright, and in another place that it was inverted, we have here a corresponding antinomy in physical science. Each is true in its own way, but not in the same way: the upright position is the real truth, the inverted position the apparent; but the apparent must be made to conform to the real, not *vice versa*.

In regard to the relation between the Infinite and the finite, it cannot give rise to any antinomies, because we have no expressions for the Infinite. No creature can conceive what is Infinite, consequently can give no statement of Infinite truth in contrast with finite conceptions of it. It is phenomenal truth, not Divine essential truth, that is revealed to us. Hence even the Tree of lives represented only phenomenal truth, in so far as it represented the truth as perceived by man. But it was truth as it appeared to the celes-

tial mind, which was in the likeness and image of the Divine mind, or of Love, Wisdom, and Power. When this is the order of the human mind, then also the trinity in man is in genuine correspondence with the Trinity in God. In this inmost region of the affections and thoughts there are no antinomies, no apparent contradictions; for these exist in a different and lower plane of the mind, and are all true in their order, but only in the manner we have explained.

To proceed with the interpretation.

As the man (*vir*) represents the internal reason, so now the woman represents the  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ , or the affections of the will, which ought to be in subordination to internal truth, or to the man *vir* or the masculine reason. When they are not in subordination, the affections are set upon things without, such as those which are presented by the senses, which in this case perform the office of the *Serpent* or the tempter. Whence the love of the woman becomes perverted, and, being alienated from the husband, is changed into vanity, pride, conceit, or in general *self-love*, of which therefore in this case she becomes the representative, as in the case of Babylon in the Apocalypse. This self-love is the soul of self-intelligence, and of all its reasonings as founded upon fallacies. This is the real ground of the subtle influence of the serpent; for if the affections of the external mind were not alienated from the internal, the influence of the Serpent would cease. But of this, more in the sequel.

The *Woman* then may represent *opposites*, according to the opposite states in which she may be. She may represent the true Church, or she may represent

the false Church; just as in like manner the *Serpent* may represent opposites; as when in one part of Scripture it represents the Devil, in another, the Redeemer. Moreover the *Tree of knowledge of good and evil* is itself the Tree of the knowledge of opposites: but this tree now occupies the *midst* of the garden.

In the Paradisiacal state it was the Tree of Lives which was in the *midst* of the Garden: the *midst* or centre of the Garden was *then* celestial love; from this love proceeded wisdom; from wisdom, intelligence or understanding guiding the reason; from intelligence, science or knowledge; so that celestial love was the centre, and knowledge the circumference. The order is now inverted: the Tree of knowledge now occupies the midst, or the central love (the perverted Eden), and the Tree of life the circumference. This *inversion of order* represents an inversion of the order of thought: and as the order of thought is now inverted, so is the nature of love inverted and changed into *self-love*.

"If a man," says Swedenborg,\* "wishes to be wise with a wisdom derived from the world, things sensual and scientific are his *Garden*; self-love and the love of the world are his *Eden*: his *East* is the west or himself: his river *Euphrates* is all his scientific principle which is accursed; the other river *Hiddekel* toward Assyria, is wild infatuated reasoning productive of falsities: the third river *Gihon*, compassing the land of Cush, is formed of the principles of evil and the false thence derived, which are the

\* *Arcana Cælestia*, art. 130.

knowledges of his faith: the fourth *Pison*, is wisdom originating in those principles, which, in the Word, are called *magic*: wherefore *Egypt*, which signifies science, after it became addicted to magic, signifies such a person; the true ground of which signification is frequently noted in the Word, as consisting in a desire to grow wise with a wisdom originating in self."

We thus see how the Tree of knowledge in the *midst* of the Garden is an inversion of the Tree of lives; and that to eat of the fruit of the Tree of knowledge so situated, is to partake of an inverted life. The command of God, therefore, not to eat of the Tree of knowledge of good and evil, is founded upon the very nature of the Tree itself; and the temptation of the woman by the Serpent to eat of that Tree, shews the predominance of the senses over the affections signified by the *woman*; while the woman giving to the man, shews the predominance of the external affections over the internal reason signified by the *man*. Hence Augustine observes:—

"In every one of us even now, when any one falls into sin, nothing else is done than was transacted in those three, the *Serpent*, the *Woman*, and the *Man*. For first of all is made the suggestion, whether through the medium of thought or the senses of the body, such as seeing, hearing, tasting, or smelling. When the suggestion is made, then if desire be not excited to sin, the cunning of the Serpent will be excluded from entrance: but if the desire be excited, then will the Woman as it were be persuaded. Sometimes, however, a manly reason both bridles and restrains the desire even when excited. Whenever this happens, then we do not fall into sin, but, after wrestling with the evil, are crowned with vic-

ry. If, on the other hand, reason gives its consent, and determines to do that which lust has excited, then is man exiled from all blessedness of life as from Paradise. For in this case sin is imputed, even though the deed be not performed; hence, in yielding consent, the conscience is held guilty."

Now Dr. Conyers Middleton\* was no mystic, and yet upon these interpretations of Augustine his observations are as follow:—

"'Tis necessary, then, for the satisfaction of our reason and the quieting our scruples, to desert the outward letter and search for the hidden allegorical sense of the story: where shall not take the trouble of collecting all the fancies and whimsical solutions of the Rabbins and the Fathers; but content myself with proposing one which appears to me the most probable and rational of them all; viz., that by *Adam* we are to understand *reason* or the *mind* of man; by *Eve*, the *flesh* or *outward senses*; by the *Serpent*, *lust* or *pleasure*: in which allegory we see clearly explained the true causes of man's fall and degeneracy: that as soon as his mind, through the weakness and treachery of his senses, became privated and seduced by the allurements of lust and pleasure, he was driven by God out of Paradise; that is, lost and forfeited the happiness and prosperity which he had enjoyed in his innocence. All this is intelligible and rational; agreeable not only to the common notions and traditions of history, but to the constant and established method of God's providence, who has wisely constituted misery, sorrow, and the debasement of our nature, to be the natural and necessary effect of vice and sin.

"This interpretation is embraced by several of the ancients, particularly St. Austin, who tells us that the same thing is repeated over again in every one of us, as oft as we fall into sin,

\* See his *works*, vol. iii., *Letter to Dr. Waterland*, p. 22.



that was represented by the *Serpent*, the *Woman*, and the *Man*: for there is, 'says he,' a suggestion or insinuation, either by a thought or the senses of the body: by which, if our inclination is not prevailed with to sin, then is the subtlety of the *Serpent* baffled and banished; but if it is prevailed with, then we yield as it were to the persuasions of the *Woman*: and when our reason has consented to execute what our lust had moved, then is *Man* effectually driven out, and expelled from all possession of happiness, as from a *Paradise*. Now, whatever opinion this *Father* might on other occasions declare, as he was not always very consistent with himself, yet at the time of writing the book whence this passage is taken, he was persuaded that in the history of the *Creation* and *Fall* of *Man*, we could not avoid absurdities and blasphemy toward *God*, without giving up the literal meaning and trusting wholly to an allegorical exposition of it."

This interpretation varies but little\* from the one we have already given; and is founded upon the necessity of an allegorical interpretation, of which *Cajetan* was equally an advocate; for, after observing that the language of the *Serpent* was not vocal, but the language of *internal suggestion*, he observes:—

"And the same kind of language is to be understood by the whole of the dialogue between the *Serpent* and the *woman*. For these metaphorical senses are not only reasonable and in accordance with the sacred Scripture, but of not a little utility to a profession of the Christian faith, especially as regards the wise of this world. For when they perceive that these things are not such as the literal sense imports, and that we do not understand and believe these things according to the letter, they do not start back from the story

\* *Augustine* seems to place the *Serpent* in an order before the *Woman*: if this be the case, it is a mistake.

concerning the rib of Adam and the Serpent, as being fables ; but revere them as mysteries, and the more easily embrace the things which are of faith."

This interpretation is moreover in accordance with the meaning of the Apostle when he said,\* "For I have espoused you unto one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear lest by any means, as the *serpent* beguiled *Eve* through his *subtlety*, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity which is in Christ."

In these words, we have the same thing acted over again in the Christian Church, which is presented to us in the Book of Genesis. For, first of all, we have the Christian Church as being *Adamic*, in the sense already explained : then the *Serpent* as a false apostle transformed into an angel of light, and presenting the false as the true : then the fear of the Apostle, that through *subtlety* the Corinthians should be led to receive the false as the true, and so become another Church in consequence of receiving another Gospel. To receive this Gospel, would have been to eat of the Tree of knowledge of good and evil. Moreover, as the Apostle distinguishes man into spirit, soul, and body, so the masculine reason corresponds to the *spirit* ; the woman to the *soul* ; and the serpent to the senses of the *body*.

As the *Serpent* represents the senses, so it represents also all that is sensuous, and hence also sensuous reasoning, which is exceedingly subtle. "The reason† why a *Serpent* denotes reasoning from the

\* 2 Cor. xi. 2.

† *Arcana Cælestia*, art. 6398.

sensuous principle is, because the interiors of man are represented in heaven by *animals* of various kinds, and hence in the Word are signified by the same. The sensual things of man were represented by *serpents*; because sensual things are the lowest appertaining to man, and are respectively as earthly things, and as it were creeping; as also may be manifest from the forms through which sensual things flow.

“There\* is nothing presented to view in the ultimates of Nature, or on this terrestrial globe, of which there does not exist some type in the heavens; such as grasses, flowers, trees, the fruits of Paradise and of the earth in general; as also animated beings, such as fishes, birds, quadrupeds. Even the very affections and inclinations of the mind, and numerous other things are represented in the heavens by animals of different kinds; such as *thoughts*, by *birds* of various forms; the *intellect* or intelligence, by *horses*; *subtlety* and *craftiness*, by *serpents*. Such representations are familiar to spirits and angels, so that there is nothing which may not be exhibited, even to the life, by similar forms. Adam, who was an inhabitant of heaven, or a spirit in a human form endowed with a human body, so that he might at the same time be an inhabitant of earth, had as yet learned no other kind of interior thought and speech than such as was *representative*; and therefore it is said that the *serpent*, which was the most subtle of all animals, spoke to him; or, according to the letter, that he addressed the woman, or, according to Schmidius, that *he said to the woman*.”

\* From a Posthumous work of Swedenborg.

"And he said unto the woman, Yea hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?"

We have seen what is meant by the *serpent*, and partly what is meant by the *woman*; we shall now further consider what is meant by the *woman* and the *man*.

It has been shewn that by *man (vir)* is represented the *masculine reason*, or the rational mind; and the function of the rational mind is to understand *truth*. Therefore, whether we say *truth* or the *rational faculty* which understands truth, each is masculine or active, and as such is represented by the *man (vir)*. In this case the genuine love or affection of the *woman* towards the *man*, is the love or affection of the woman toward *truth*, by which she is willing to be governed, thus to be passive. Hence this *love or affection of truth* is the essentially feminine principle, or *woman*; and when these two principles, the knowledge of truth and the love of truth, are conjoined in one individual being, who, as *Adam*, is simultaneously male and female, then is man (*homo*) or Adam, as Augustine says, "*conjugal in himself*." Hence, when Christ is regarded as the Word, or Divine Truth, or the Eternal Logos or Reason, the relation in which the Church is represented as standing toward Him, is that of *woman* or the *Bride*, who is in the love or affection of Divine Truth or the Word; so that the two are represented as about to be united or married; whence it is said that "the marriage of the Lamb is come, and the bride hath made herself ready."

Now the very Church itself, as the *woman*, is

formed out of the body of Christ; for we are members, says the Apostle, of His body, of His flesh, and of his bones; and we have seen that as *bone* is a part of the body in which there is comparatively little life, so *flesh* is taken to signify that in which a higher or even the highest degree of life resides; whence in Scripture "the fleshly tables of the heart" is an expression signifying a heart softened or subdued by divine love.

The relation, then, of the woman to the man, is the same with the relation of the Church to Christ; for as the Church is said to be a member of his very bones, thus to be as it were formed out of them; so the woman in Genesis, is formed out of the *bone* of the man, *i.e.*, out of *truth* in its ultimated or lowest forms, such as it is when apprehended by the external reason of the natural mind, or when it exists as a matter of memory or external science. Out of this external truth the woman had been formed, and from this had progressed to higher degrees of life represented by *flesh*; so that the man and the woman together, or the *truth* which is of thought, and the *affection* which is of will, had become one in regard to spiritual life, represented by "*one flesh*;"—"they shall be one flesh."

It is the disruption of this unity, that we are about to consider; and thus the transition of the *woman* from a good signification to a bad one.

When man was in his orderly state, the affection represented by the *woman* was an affection for truth; but for truth as it was in the masculine principle or reason, derived from Jehovah God or from an *à priori* source, as in the case of inspiration, or as represented

by the Tree of lives in the midst of the garden. When man declined into a disorderly state, wisdom was sought not from an *à priori*, but from an *à posteriori* source : in other words, not from within but from without ; not from an internal source, but from an external ; and this external source was substituted for the internal, and regarded as the very central source, the very midst of the garden, from which all perceptions of true knowledge were to be derived. Hence the affection of the *woman* was not for wisdom, but for *science* ; not for internal truth, but for external truth ; not for spiritual truth, but for natural truth ; not for *wisdom* derived from heaven, but for *knowledge* derived from Nature. And so completely has this principle been verified in the present day, that men of science have sought for the wisdom of the Adamic Church in the cultivation of the natural sciences ; and because they cannot find it, conclude that Paradise represented a state as rudimentary and ignorant as that of children !—all which arises from the false hypothesis, that there is only one way of access to the rational faculty, and that the *à posteriori* ; and yet that there is another, might even be shewn from the instincts of animals,—the bird, the beaver, the bee, the ant, who know the sciences by an *à priori* way without observation, experiment, or comparison. But of this we shall treat further as we proceed.

"And the serpent said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said." "The Serpent *said*—the woman *said*—God *said*."—What is meant by "God *said*?" We have already seen that by "the serpent *said*," is sig-

nified the internal suggestion of the serpent; and in like manner when we read that "God said," by *saying* in this case, is signified *internal suggestion*. Augustine has discoursed somewhat largely upon the subject; and on the passage, "God *said* it is not good that man should be alone," observes:\*

"Let us now see how we are here to understand the expression 'God *said*.' . . . Did God *say* these things in so many words and syllables uttered in time? Or is it an expression of the reason which was eminently in the Word of God, ordaining that the woman should be so made, and which reason the Scripture had always implied whenever it said, *God said* let this or that be, when all things were originally created? Or did God *say* this in the mind of the man himself, after the manner in which he speaks to some of his servants, *in* his servants themselves: of which kind of servants was he who said in the Psalm, 'I will hear what the Lord God shall speak *in* me?' Or was any revelation upon this subject made to the man himself, *in* the man himself by some Angel, in the manner of external voices, although Scripture is silent as to whether it was heard in dreams, or in an ecstasy; for revelations were made in this manner? Or did the revelation take place in some other way, such as occurred to the prophets, where it is written, 'And the Angel who spake *in* me, said unto me?' Or was it through the medium of some created substance that the voice was uttered, as when it was said from the *cloud*, 'This is my beloved Son?' Which of all these methods was adopted in the present case, we are not able clearly to comprehend. But let us most certainly maintain, that God did really say these things; and that if He said them with an audible voice, in the likeness of a bodily form, and under the conditions of time, He did so not in his own Person, but through the medium of some

\* *De Genesi ad literam*, lib. ix.

*creature* subordinated to his power, as we have already shewn in our preceding Book."

In this passage St. Augustine was unable to determine which of these methods of communication was employed by the Almighty in speaking to Adam; but, when the Serpent speaks, he says in his Treatise *De Genesi contra Manichæos*, that it was in the way of *internal suggestion*. Thus he observes:—

"Neither ought we to wonder *how* the Serpent could speak to the Woman, when the Woman was in Paradise and the Serpent was not; for even the woman was not in Paradise, so much in respect to place, as in respect to a state of blessedness; or, even though there were a place called Paradise in which Adam and the woman dwelt as to the body, ought we to understand the approach of the devil to have been made in a corporeal manner? Certainly not, but rather after a spiritual manner, as when the Apostle says—'according to the Prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience.' Did then the Prince of the power of the air appear to them visibly; or approach by corporeal spaces to those in whom he works? Assuredly not; but whatever he is able to do, he in wonderful ways *suggests through the medium of the thoughts*; which *suggestions* they resist who can truly say with the Apostle,—'For we are not ignorant of his devices.' How did he approach to Judas when persuading him to betray the Lord? Was it by proximity of space, or was he visible to the bodily eyes? Nay, but rather as it is said, he *entered into his heart*. But if a man wishes to keep the garden of Paradise, he repels him. For God placed man in Paradise that he might dress and keep it; for so it is said of the Church in the *Song of Songs*.—'A Garden enclosed, a fountain sealed,' into which there is no admission for the



Author of perverse persuasions. Still, however, it is he who deceives, but by means of the *woman*. For our *reason* cannot be induced to consent to sin, except when *delight* is excited in that part of the mind which ought to obey *reason* as the ruling husband."

Thus it was in the way of *internal suggestion* that, as Augustine says, the Serpent spake to the woman; and according to Swedenborg, it was in the same way that God spake to Adam; but there is this difference in the source of the suggestions; suggestions proceeding from God, flow from within to without; suggestions proceeding from the Serpent flow from without to within. The order of suggestion in one case is contrary to the order of suggestion in the other: the order of thought, and thus the quality of the thoughts, in both cases run counter the one to the other: the one negatives the other. Hence the origin of affirmative and negative states of mind; of certainty, doubt, and denial; doubt being the intermediate between the extremes.

*Deus affirmat: mulier dubitat: serpens negat.* That is, *Deus affirmat* when God speaks to the internal mind by an internal way; thus producing internal intuitions which are the axiomatic principles, the *yea, yea*, and the *nay, nay*, of the internal or celestial mind; whence arise assurance and certainty. On the other hand, the *Mulier*, the external mind divided from the internal—*dubitat*. As long as it was under the control of the *masculine reason* and of its intuitions from within, there was no room for scepticism; but when it became separated from these intuitions, it had to seek light from another source,—from with-

out instead of within: from the *serpent* instead of the *husband*. Thus the narrative in Genesis lays open the origin of all Scepticism and Infidelity.

And first with respect to Scepticism.

Lord Bacon has said, that, "He who begins with believing shall end in doubting, and he who begins with doubting shall end in believing." This is either true or untrue according to the quality of the doubt or belief. To doubt the truth of error is *in itself* a good: to doubt the truth of truth is *in itself* an evil. There are, however, circumstances since the Fall, under which to doubt the truth even of truth itself, is not always an evil. It was a maxim of the Fathers, that we must begin with believing, if we would understand: *Crede, si vis intelligere*. Upon this point, the observations of Swedenborg enable us to reconcile both Lord Bacon and St. Augustine with each other.

"There\* are some persons who are in *doubt* before they *deny*; and there are others who are in *doubt* before they *affirm*. They who are in doubt before they deny, are those who incline to a life of evil; but they who are in doubt before they affirm, are those who incline to a life of goodness; to which life, when they suffer themselves to be bended by the Lord, they then affirm the truths of things spiritual and celestial in proportion as they think about them."

They who are in doubt before they affirm, are interiorly in the affirmative principle, and exteriorly in the negative; they who are in doubt before they

\* *Arcana Caelestia*, art. 2568.

deny, are interiorly in the negative principle and exteriorly in the affirmative. The doubt arises from not seeing which to choose, or, as is commonly said, not seeing our way. The judgment is held in a state of equilibrium, or preponderates sometimes on one side, and sometimes on the other. Sometimes a negative principle prevails, and in this case the affections are in harmony with error, and disharmony with truth. The error is desired as a means to the end in view. Sometimes the affirmative principle prevails; that is to say, *an affection of truth*, or a love of the truth that so it should be. This is a state arising from the latent *good* of the will, which is also the latent verifying faculty. In this case the predisposing affections are in harmony with truth, and in disharmony with error. These affections are the basis of all spiritual perception or discernment, and are the distinctive characteristic of the spiritual man. It is in relation to these that truth is determined to be truth, that is to say, truth is determined to be truth by *good*; and, therefore, whether in moral or spiritual things, obedience is the basis of perception. "If any man will do the will of my Father which is in heaven, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." The exterior becomes thus the basis of the interior, the natural the basis of the spiritual; filial obedience to parental authority, the basis of rational obedience to Divine law. In either case, the opponent principle is self-love or self-intelligence. Now the natural selfhood of man is created, formed, and completed out of the things relating to external Nature, or those of time and sense: and in this case

all the reasoning in regard to spiritual things which is founded upon these, is founded upon *fallacies*, and is therefore essentially *negative* in regard to Divine Truth.

From what has been said, it may be seen that the *affirmative* principle is that perception of truth which arises from the intellect being inspired with good affections, whereby even the natural mind is vivified and becomes a living soul; the *sceptical* principle is the external reason inspired with external affections, and therefore subordinated to those affections. The *negative* principle is the love of self and of the world, or of the things of time and sense, which is the *serpent*, according to whose subtle fallacies, as we shall see, *selfhood* is the genuine source of all moral action, or of all duty to God and the neighbor.

Let us apply these remarks to the interpretation of the written Word.

The Word of God written, is pre-eminently, as the Word, internal or spiritual truth; pre-eminently that which "God *hath said*." It is to this day questionable whether this internal sense exists: thus, whether God has thus spoken—"Yea, hath God said?" The early Christian Church (Adam) affirmed it: and even at the present day one part of the Church, the *man* (internal reason) affirms it. Another part of the Church—the reason externalized by the *woman*—doubts it. Another part of the Church, the *serpent*—the Criticism derived from sensuous fallacies, denies it. The early Church, or *Adam*, affirms that *God hath said*; in confirmation of which it appeals to the earliest interpreters. Thus Bishop Marsh:—

"The earliest interpreters\* of the Scripture were the Jews, who, because it is *divinely inspired*, considered the *interpretation* of it as subject to different rules from those which are applicable to other books. They considered, therefore, the words of Scripture as implying more than was conveyed by their literal sense; whence they perpetually sought for remote and mystical meanings."†

So Archdeacon Lyall :‡—

"A moment's thought will shew, that the doctrine of a *concealed sense* was a necessary conclusion in their minds: it was scarcely possible for them to have regarded it as the *inspired Word of God*, without at the same time attributing to it a meaning beyond what was conveyed by the literal interpretation."

Here we see the origin of their *Cabbala*; the fundamental principle of which was, that all things upon earth were copies of the things in heaven. But not only are their interpretations declared to be fanciful, but the very principle upon which they are founded, is by one part of the Church denied, although by another part of the Church it is affirmed. From this denial on one side, and affirmation on the other, arises in the Church *doubt*; as in case of the individual mind, which sometimes affirms and sometimes denies; not knowing whether to affirm or deny; thus regarding the whole as questionable; the modern Church having no distinctive teaching upon the subject, and no power of discrimination between the

\* *Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible.* Lecture xi.

† It is evident in this case, that the *internal sense* of Scripture was regarded as arising out of its Divine *inspiration*.

‡ *Propædia Prophetica*, p. 270.

fanciful and the real, the certain and the questionable, the analogical relation and the metaphorical figure; in fine, between what God hath said and what God hath not said.\*

Now the interpretation of what God hath said, involves the principles both of *inspiration* and *intuition*.†

First in regard to *inspiration* considered as a state of the mind.

The probability has been conceded that *inspiration*,‡ if analyzed psychologically, is a form of the reason; but that, if viewed theologically, it is an elevated state of this faculty brought about by the miraculous and direct operation of God's Spirit; so that in this view it differs in kind, and not merely in degree, from human genius. In the state of Paradise, *inspiration*, both psychologically and theologically, was indeed a form of the reason, elevated but *not* miraculously; and so it resembled what we commonly call *genius*, but the genius was celestial.—"The first people," says Swedenborg,§ "who constituted the

\* Bishop Marsh observes in his Third Lecture on the Interpretation of the Bible—"Because an inspired Apostle has declared that his wisdom was derived from the suggestions of the Holy Spirit, let us not imagine that *our* wisdom will be dignified by the same supernatural aid. Because an inspired Apostle has declared that his wisdom was not the wisdom of man, but the power of God, let us not imagine that the same divine illumination, the same intellectual light, in which St. Paul composed his Epistles, will be infused into a modern expounder of them."—Has then the Christian *no* divine illumination at all? or if he has, and it does not set aside human learning (for illumination supposes something to be illuminated), why should human learning set aside divine illumination?

† Farrar's *Bampton Lectures*. Note, p. 476. ‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 40, 470.

§ *Arcana Cælestia*, art. 310. See our *Appendix*.

Most Ancient Church, were of a† *celestial genius*, consequently had celestial seeds implanted in them: hence their descendants had seed in them from a celestial origin; seed from a celestial origin is of such a nature that love rules the whole mind, and makes it one; for the human mind consists of two parts, will and understanding: by virtue of love or good those people perceived the things relating to faith or truth, and thus their mind was single or one." In this case, the affirmative principle of truth was in what is called by some the voluntary, by some the emotional part of the mind. This love was an affection for the truth that so it should be; it was the latent heat generating the light whence arose *intuition*. Had this not been the case, the typical character of Creation would have been of no use; for there would have been no faculties to perceive and comprehend it. The very typical meanings of Creation, therefore, in the garden of Eden presupposed certain corresponding faculties of the human mind capable of perceiving them.

"If we are taught," says Bishop Horne,\* "that Heaven resembles the garden of Eden, it seems fair and reasonable to conclude that *the garden of Eden resembled Heaven*, and was from the beginning intended to do so; that like the Temple under the Law, and the Church under the Gospel, it was for its happy possessors a place chosen for the residence of God; *a place designed to represent and furnish them with*

\* A *celestial genius* was that character of mind in which the affections were predominant; but these affections exalted the intellect, and produced *genius* in the sense of superior talent, as will be seen in the sequel.

† *Sermons*, vol. i., p. 68.

*ideas of heavenly things*; a place sacred to contemplation and devotion; in one word, it was the primitive Temple and Church, formed and consecrated for the use of man in his state of innocence. There, undisturbed by care and as yet unassailed by temptation, all his faculties perfect, and his appetites in subjection, he walked with God as a man walketh with his friend; and *enjoyed communion with heaven*; though his abode was upon earth He studied the works of God as they came fresh from the hands of the workmaster; and in the Creation, as in a glass, he was taught to behold the glories of the Creator."

The same divine signification of the objects in Paradise and of the works of Creation in general, is presented in the following remarks:—

"It\* is very evident that *the earthly Paradise represented the heavenly*, or that there was extant in one a type of the other: for *there is nothing upon earth to which there is not a something correspondent in heaven*; for whatsoever in the effect is created or produced, this descends from heaven; so that there is nothing upon earth which is not typical of that from which it originated. For all uses are celestial: effects are only uses sent forth into the circle of nature. The ends of uses are divine; wherefore all things that are produced are mere images of heaven, just as man or Adam was made an image of God. And, therefore, the representations of heavenly things are made by means of the images of corresponding effects, such as those existing upon earth. Hence it was that *the whole of the garden planted in Eden represented the heavenly Paradise*, into which Adam

\* From a posthumous work of Swedenborg.



is by tradition said to have been translated; that together with the delights of nature and of the world, he might enjoy the delights of heaven. As, therefore, effects in the natural world are symbols of heavenly things, so the Tree of life planted in the midst of the garden signified Wisdom flowing from heaven by a *superior way* into the mind: and the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil, intelligence flowing into the same mind by an *inferior way*, or from the world and its nature through the senses and the animal soul. For the way leading into the human mind is twofold; namely, one from heaven through the spirit; the other from the world, through the senses and the animal soul. The Tree of wisdom or of life is therefore placed in the midst of the garden; for it is in *wisdom* that there is true life; whereas the tree of *knowledge* is planted in the mind by external knowledges."

It is very true that the doctrine that Creation below is a copy of Creation above, was adopted into the Jewish *Cabbala*; it is true that Bishop Horne, Jones of Nayland, and others, transferred it into their system of theology. But none of these were the inventors or discoverers of that doctrine; they only transferred it from ancient tradition into their theological system; just as Augustine, Origen, Ambrose, and others had done before them; nay, as Dean Trench has done, in the present day, in his *Notes on the Parables*.\*

But if Paradise was a type of heaven, and if the Temple also was a type of heaven, they were each of

them types upon the same principle; each signifying after its own way things which are in the heavens. The same is the case with the Church which has the written *Word of God*, the natural truths of which are signs of such as are spiritual, just as the earthly is a type of the heavenly; or the natural could never have been made use of to denote the spiritual, the earthly to denote the heavenly.

"The worldly things\* and things of civil judication, such as are the judgments, the statutes, and the laws promulgated by the Lord from Mount Sinai, are Divine and holy by *inspiration*: but inspiration is not *dictation* but is *influx from the Divine*. What flows in from the Divine passes through heaven, and is there celestial and spiritual; but when it comes into the world it becomes worldly, yet so as inwardly to contain in it those principles. From these considerations it is evident, whence and where the Word hath in it its Divine principle, and *what is Inspiration*."

This is the only account of the origin of the Scriptures adequate to the expression—*Word of God*. But of what use would be this Divine principle in the Word, if man had no faculty by which to perceive it? Theologically it might be true, that such a Divine principle existed; psychologically it would be untrue, or would be regarded as such. For in order to recognize this Divine principle, there must previously be formed in the mind a perceptive or *intuitive* faculty.—But what or whence is this faculty? This brings us to the subject of *intuition*.

\* *Arcana Cœlestia*, 9094.

"*Intuition*,"\* says Swedenborg, "from a superior principle into an inferior one, or, what is the same thing, from an interior principle into an exterior, is called *Influx*, because it is effected by influx: as in the case of the interior vision appertaining to man, unless it flowed continually into his external vision or that of the eye, it would be impossible for the latter to take in and discern any object; because it is in the interior vision which, by means of the eye, takes in those things which the eye sees, and not the eye itself, although it appears so. Hence also it may be seen how much that man is involved in the fallacies of the senses, who believes that it is the eye that sees; when the truth is, that it is the sight of his spirit, which is interior sight, that sees by means of the eye. . . . But this is not all: the case is similar with respect to this interior sight, or that of the spirit: this also does not see of itself, but from a vision still more interior, which is that of the rational principle: nay, even this does not see of itself, but there is a sight still more interior, which is that of the internal man. But we must advance further yet; for neither does the internal man see of itself; but it is the Lord, by means of the internal man, who alone sees because He alone lives; and He gives to man the faculty of seeing, and with it the appearance as if it were he himself who saw."

Such is the origin of *intuition* in its relation to Divine truth, or to what God said to the Adamic Church. It was, then, no other than these Divine truths which had been perceived by this *intuition*,

\* *Ibid.*, 1954.

and thus spoken inwardly to man, that now became to the Church a subject of *doubt*: and this because the Church had begun to lose its intuitive or perceptive faculty, which now began to be formed in an inverse order, namely, from without to within; in like manner as it was formed before man had reached the Paradisiacal state, and had been inspired with the breath of lives so as to become, even as to his external man, a living soul. Let us consider this intuition in relation to the written Word.

Do we acknowledge any part of the written Word to have any internal or spiritual sense? If so, what is the relation of that sense to its *inspiration*? Has inspiration nothing to do with it? Shall we say that, even in this case, the Church has never ventured to determine the nature of the Inspiration of the Bible? Never in fact ventured to say that the spiritual sense is the effect, and Divine inspiration the cause; and that the nature of the effect is the same with the nature of the cause; *inspiration* being the *influx* of Divine truth, or of the Spirit of Truth into the external letter as apprehended by the mind? Can we not see that our modern discussions concerning the existence of an internal sense of the written Word of God, are simply the revival of the question, *Yea, hath God said?*—for that which *God hath said*, is the *Word of God*.

We affirm, then, that if there is no internal sense given by *inspiration*, there can be no *intuition*; for there is nothing upon which the intuitive faculty can exercise itself; nothing even by which to form the intuitive faculty itself. Practically, therefore, inspi-

ration and intuition stand or fall together, in other words, inspiration and spiritual discernment; and if spiritual discernment fails, what is left but the discernment of the natural man, who reasons from things natural to things spiritual? the consequence of which is, he doubts, perverts, or denies them. It is the *Serpent*, and the Serpent alone, which in this case becomes the interpreter of Scripture, and raises a question in the mind of the woman and thence of the man with respect to every part of it; which first reduces revealed theology to a system of revealed naturalism; then, rejecting this naturalism as absurd, betakes itself to some system of Natural Theology; then, upon the same principle, proceeds to destroy natural Theology, as it had previously destroyed revealed; the result of which is, a complete vastation of all religion, and a revolution in the Church and civil society. Take an illustration. The grand object of the work of D'Holbach was—

“To shew\* that there is no God: the first part is occupied by the most rigorous *materialism*, and is designed to prove that there is no such thing as mind—nothing beyond the material fabric which is maintained by simple and invariable laws; and that the soul is a mode of (material) organism, the mere action of the body under different functions. The freedom of the will and immortality are accordingly *denied*. The first part having been directed to disprove the existence of mind; the second part is designed against religion. The author attributes the idea which man has formed of a First Cause, to fear generated through suffering; and attempts to shew the insufficiency of the *à priori* argument in favor of a

\* Farrar's *Bampton Lectures*, page 256.

God; omitting the consideration of the arguments derived from final causes. Nature becomes in his system a machine; man, a (material) organism: morality, *self-interest*: Deity, a fiction."

Such is the religion of the *Serpent*; who first makes a god of a man's brain, and ultimately a god of his belly; "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Now, we are told that—

"A belief\* that the place of punishment is full of *serpents*, equally pervades the Gothic, the Persian, and the Hindoo mythologies; nor is it easy to say whence this coincidence respecting that particular mode of torture more than any other, could have arisen, except from some universal mutilated tradition that 'the *Dragon*, that *old Serpent*, which is the Devil and Satan,' had been cast into the lake of fire and brimstone."

"In a similar manner the Persians supposed the place of torment to be a dark and bottomless pit, full of *scorpions* and *serpents*; which gnaw and sting the feet of the damned."

... "The notions of the Hindoos are evidently derived from the same source. In their mythology 'the king of the evil spirits,' or demons, is called the king of *serpents*; of which poisonous reptiles, folded together in horrible contortions, their hell, or Naraka, is formed."

Something similar to this is to be found in the Apocalypse; where we read of *Scorpion-locusts* who had a king over them, whose name was Apollyon. They had tails like unto the tails of *scorpions*, "that is," say Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, Aquinas, and most of the ancient Commentators, "*crafty opinions* with which they outwardly blandish and

\* Faber's *Bampton Lectures*, page 103, etc.

secretly sting." According to this account, the scorpion tail signifies the *crafty opinions* and *subtle fallacies* arising from mere sensuous ratiocination, by which the spiritual life of man is injured. Swedenborg regards the sting as signifying *subtle falsifications arising from sensuous expositions of the Word*, by means of which a stupor is superinduced upon the understanding in regard to spiritual things.

2. "*And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden.*"

3. "*But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.*"

The trees of the garden were, as we have seen,\* those which were nourished by the four rivers, these rivers being of distinct orders, one subordinate to the other; the first, *Pison*, had reference to the inmost affections of the *will*, and the trees nourished by this river to the perception of those truths which minister to these affections: the second, *Gihon*, had reference to the truths of *wisdom*, and the trees on this river to the perceptions of those truths: the third, *Hiddekel*, had reference to the truths which minister to the *rational faculty*, and the trees on this river to the understanding of these truths: the fourth, *Euphrates*, had reference to the truths which supply the *memory*, and the trees on this river to the knowledge of these truths. Of all these trees, in their successive orders, man was permitted to eat. The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and *good fruits*. The

\* See Tract No. VI., p. 54.

fruits of these trees are the produce of the mind, from these several sources, in their successive gradations; and in their complex constituted the wisdom in general of the Adamic Church.

We come now more particularly to "*the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden.*" on which subject Swedenborg observes, with respect to the Adamic Church—

"It is to be observed,\* that it was never forbidden them to procure for themselves knowledges from heaven concerning good and evil, for thereby their intelligence and wisdom were perfected. Neither was it forbidden to procure to themselves knowledges of good and evil from the world, for thence was the science of their natural man. But it was forbidden to view these knowledges by a *posterior way*; inasmuch as it was given them to see all things before their eyes in the world by a *prior way*, and thence to imbibe knowledges. To view the world and all things therein by a *prior way*, and thence to imbibe knowledges, is to view them from the light of heaven, and thereby to know their quality; wherefore also by knowledges from the world they were enabled to confirm things celestial, and so to corroborate their wisdom. But it was forbidden them to view knowledges from the world by a *posterior way*; as is the case when conclusions are drawn from them concerning things celestial, and thus in an *inverse order*, which is called by the learned the order of Physical or Natural Influx, which cannot by any means be effected into things celestial. Such did the men of

\* *Apocalypse Explained*, art. 739.



the Ancient Church become, when they began to love worldly things above celestial, and to be self-elated, and to glory on account of their wisdom; whence their posterity became sensual, and then their *sensual principle*, which is understood by the *serpent*, seduced them; for the sensual principle is not willing to advance by any other than a posterior way."

This therefore is what is signified by the *Tree of the science of good and evil in the midst of the garden*, of which it was forbidden them to eat.

"That\* it was allowable for them to procure for themselves knowledges from the world, and to view them by a prior way, is signified (in Gen. ii. 9) by Jehovah God causing "*to grow out of the ground every tree desirable to the sight and good for food;*" for by *trees* are signified knowledges and perceptions; by "*desirable to the sight*" is signified desirable to the understanding; and by "*good for food*" is signified what conduces to the nourishment of the mind. The knowledges of good and evil from the Lord, from which *wisdom* is derived, and the knowledges of good and evil from the world, from which *science* is derived, were represented by the *Tree of lives* and by the *Tree of science of good and evil in the midst of the garden*. That it was allowed them to appropriate to themselves knowledges from whatever source, as well from *heaven* as from the *world*, only that they should not proceed in an *inverse order*, by reasoning from them concerning things celestial instead of thinking from things celestial concerning things worldly, is signified by Jehovah God commanding

\* *Apocalypse Explained*, art. 739.

them "*to eat of every tree of the garden,*" but not of the *tree of the science of good and evil*. That otherwise celestial wisdom and the Church would perish with them, is signified by "*in the day thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die;*"—to eat in the spiritual sense, signifying to appropriate to themselves. That the sensual principle seduced them because it is proximately extant to the world, and thence feeleth whatever is pleasurable and delightful from the world, from which it is in fallacies, whilst it is ignorant of and also rejects celestial things, is signified by "*the serpent*"—the *serpent* denoting the sensual principle, and no other sensual principle than what was of themselves. The reason why *the serpent* is the Devil and Satan is, because the sensual principle communicates with Hell, and makes one therewith; for in it resides all the evil of man in the complex. And whereas man from the sensual principle reasons from fallacies, and from the delights of the loves of the world and the body, and this with much readiness and subtlety, therefore *the serpent* is said to be "*more subtle than any wild beast of the field which Jehovah God had made*"—the "wild beast of the field," in the spiritual sense, signifying the affection of the natural man."

By "*the midst of the garden,*" then, we have seen to be signified the inmost or centre of the mind, that is to say, the *delight of love*, the source of its perceptions of Divine Wisdom. When the Tree of science or knowledge is transferred to the midst of the garden, the delight of external science or knowledge has taken the place of the delights of

Wisdom. Hence as science or knowledge is derived from things natural or from an external source, and the life of heavenly love from an internal source, the operations of the mind have become *inverted*, and sense or science is made the first principle from which is instituted enquiry into things divine. It was this twofold source to which the Apostle referred when he said—"Eye hath not seen, neither hath ear heard, etc., the things which God hath laid up for them that love Him;"—i.e., they do not come into the interior man by the way of the external senses—but God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit—the Spirit of Truth—the order of whose operations is from within to without, not from without to within. In this case the affections of the will, which constitute the inner way and are in the midst of the Garden, are the first to receive the Spirit of Truth; because, in such a state, there is a love of the Truth, and hence a perception of it. It is the pure in heart who shall see God.

This, then, was the order of thought belonging to the Christian Church, in so far as it was Adamic, or as the Apostle calls it, A MAN, A NEW MAN, A PERFECT MAN. This was the primeval order of thought in Paradise: man was instructed not merely through the medium of the senses or external sciences, as in the present day; but through the medium of affections by revelations from God through heaven, by dreams also, and visions; and by means of heavenly affections Truth from heaven was perceived, by which the natural understanding was enlightened even as to natural things; and therefore if, after being in-

structed by revelations from the Spirit of God concerning the Christian religion, the Apostle had relapsed into the contrary method; and from what the eye had seen, and the ear heard, and the heart unconverted had conceived, had reasoned concerning the things of the Spirit of God, the Apostle would have fallen as did the early Adamic Church; for then, it is certain, that as to all those things which had been revealed to him by the Spirit of God, he would have begun to say, "*Yea, hath God said?*" So fell the Church of Ephesus from her first love, to which if she did not return, her candlestick was to be removed out of its place. It was as true in the primeval Church as it is now—that as little children we ought not to love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth; for that "*hereby we know that we are of the truth.*"

From these remarks it will be seen, that natural science came to the Adamic Church\* more easily than it does now, and was viewed from an *à priori* principle: that natural reason thus enlightened had intuitions of science which have now ceased, but which resembled those which we commonly call *genius*; as when we speak of a mathematical genius, a musical genius, an arithmetical genius, a poetical genius, and so forth. For the operations of the mind being then in true order, there were intuitions of reason with regard to science, which resembled the intuitions of instinct. The ends being perceived, the means were perceived. No such long and laboured demonstrations, as now, were then requisite; for "*wisdom* rained down

\* Which was in *Asia*.

skill and knowledge ;"—" she reached from one *end* to the other, and sweetly did she order all things ;"—she was "*a Tree of life* to them that laid hold upon her."

In the present day, the way to physical science is not *à priori* but *à posteriori* ; that is, by induction from observation and experiment ; and if a man were now to attempt the *à priori* method, an inverted order of reason would have to determine upon the divine order of Nature. The inductive method, however, which we are now obliged to pursue, and which has led to such great results, is itself a result of the Fall : though it has opened the kingdom of Nature to all enquirers, it has not opened the kingdom of heaven or made believers ; nor has it shewn the way to the Tree of life, but only to the Tree of knowledge.

This Tree of knowledge it is, which, in the present day, is in the midst of the garden of the scientific world ; and why, it is said, should it not ? Is not science God's precious gift, light coming from the Father of lights ; and specially coming in greater splendour in this very age in which we live, and given to us by His grace, in order that by means of it we may see more clearly than before his glory and his goodness ? Is not science itself God's revelation ; and in the light of this revelation do we not see the light of the other ? *Quo magis rerum naturam cognoscimus, eo magis Deum cognoscimus : vox enim Naturæ vox Dei.*—Nay, but consider ! If Nature proclaimed in Paradise that the visible Creation was only a type of the invisible ; that all things upon earth were copies of things in the heavens ; who now hears the divine voice of Nature ? Who even is willing to hear ? Like the

voice of God, Nature has more to tell us than we are prepared to listen to. If the present age be the age of *science*, the age in Paradise was the age of *wisdom*; and, as such, an age of sublimer love, sublimer thought, and sublimer language than the age of science. Nevertheless modern science is fulfilling a great destiny; for it is not only supplying the loss of those intuitions of natural science which were enjoyed in Paradise, but is also beginning to point to those mysteries which lie hid behind the typical forms of Nature, which it can never of itself explain, but the existence of which it may testify.\* These mysteries, as we have said, were indicated by the Tree of life in Paradise, where an instinctive knowledge or science of Nature arose out of the order of thought proceeding from exalted love.

"All† animals as well those which move on the earth, and fly in the air, and swim in the water, are impelled according to their loves; and into their loves flow whatsoever things conduce to their life, viz., to food, to habitation, and to procreation. Hence every kind knows its own aliment, its own dwelling-places, and all that appertains to their conjugal principle, such as how to consociate, build nests, educate the young. Bees also know how to build their cells, to suck honey out of flowers, to build the honeycombs, and to provide against the approach of winter, and even to practise some form of government under a governor, beside other wonderful particulars. All these things are effected by influx into their loves: it is the forms of their affections only which vary the effects of life.

\* *Tract* No. V., p. 35.

† *Arcana Caelestia*, 4776.

All the knowledges above mentioned are in their loves. What then would there not be in heavenly love, provided man was in it! Would there not be the all of wisdom and intelligence which is in heaven? For this cause indeed it is, that they who have lived in charity, and no others, are received into heaven; and that in virtue of charity they are in the capacity of receiving and imbibing all truths, that is, all the things of faith." Hence also—

"The\* first *speech* of the parents of the human race could by no means be any other than *interior*; such as is the sublimer thought of the mind, or such as is that of celestial spirits and angels; namely, the *speech* which is *representative of objects* by forms, especially those seen in Paradise and its animal kingdom; in which, from various indications, they perceived their inmost nature, and hence also the spiritual and celestial principle which corresponded to the forms which were effigied. Hence, at the first glance of the eye, they beheld the uses of trees and vegetables, the affections of beasts, the causes of effects, and the ends of causes. These things could not flow into the sphere of their mind, except with a life and a light of life; since they lived according to order *à priori*, namely, divine order, as spiritual essences endowed with a material body.

"But inasmuch as we, the posterity of Adam, are born and educated into a natural life, *we are profoundly ignorant of what this celestial or superior way is*; for where there is no love of a thing, there is no knowledge of it."

\* From a posthumous work of Swedenborg.

4. "*And the Serpent said unto the Woman, Ye shall not surely die.*"

On a former occasion we observed, that the expression "*God said*" indicated the affirmative principle; which is an affection of truth descending from above into the rational mind, arising from a state of latent good in the will, or a love that so it should be: in which case the *woman* loved and hence perceived that it is not knowledge that gives life, but wisdom: that wisdom is of the will and intellect together: knowledge of the intellect alone. Now, as the *woman* represents the *selfhood* of the man as to his affections, which are his real selfhood; when this selfhood is not subordinate to internal reason, but is actuated by its own love of external things, it becomes *self-love*, and as such is necessarily opposite to the man. And as the *man (vir)* represented the affirmative state of reason, so the opposite to affirmation is negation, which begins to be now signified by the *woman*.

Hence the order of thought is, first, the impressions derived from the senses, together with their delights, which are represented by the *Serpent*: with these things stored up in the memory, the affections of the natural mind (the *woman*) are in accordance; and when the rational faculty yields to these affections instead of controlling them, it reasons from the things of outward Nature, hence of time and space; in which case, the ideas of the mind, even in the most subtle metaphysical reasoning, are materialistic and even sensuous, in which the life of the intellect is now made to consist. Hence both the rational faculty and the affections of the will now appear to



themselves to *live*; and indeed to live from themselves, and as such not to be in any state of *death* either in regard to the will or the reason. Such is the negative state of the mind in regard to Divine truth, while yet it appears to itself affirmative, having passed on from a state of doubt to a state of positive affirmation; inasmuch as it is conscious to itself of seeing the truth unobscured by any doubt; although the truth which it sees is directly the opposite of genuine truth.

5. "*For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as Gods knowing good and evil.*"

"*Your eyes shall be opened:*" an expression which, like the terms *naked, woman, serpent, wise*, has a good sense and a bad sense. In a good sense, it signifies a perception from genuine love that good is good and evil is evil; in a bad sense, perception from perverted love that good is evil and evil is good; the intermediate state being a state of *doubt* of what is good and what is evil. As motives to the transition from one opposite to the other there are represented things apparently good. For it is a good thing to have one's eyes opened: a good thing to be free from doubt; a good thing to be like God; a good thing to have a knowledge of good that it is good, and of evil that it is evil; and he who has this knowledge has the knowledge proper to his love, and his love is the same with his life, and therefore he is not dead but liveth. This "*God doth know,*" or Divine Truth itself dictates; and all dictates of Divine Truth, *i. e.*, all intuitions arising from this source, are only the Spirit bearing

witness with our spirit. Hence as the outer sense of touch is the basis of all outer sensations, so the corresponding inner sense, which is that of feeling and hence of affection, is the basis of all inner sensation; and the stronger is self-love, the more assured is self-vision. And what is it to be in the image and likeness of God, but to be as God? And what is it to be as God, but to determine from our own selfhood, our own rational powers, what is good and what is evil, what is true and what is false? Nay, is not this the voice of God speaking within us? And what the voice of God speaks, does it not proceed from God, and is it not Divine? It is thus that, at first, the apparent is the counterfeit of the real; and, finally, the false the counterfeit of the true.

"The case with the people before the Flood," says Swedenborg,\* "was this; that at length they were left almost entirely destitute of any remains of good and truth; by reason of their being of such a genius and temper, that they were infected with dreadful and abominable persuasions respecting all things whatsoever which occurred and fell into their thoughts; so that they were not at all willing to recede from them. And this was chiefly owing to *self-love*, in consequence whereof they supposed themselves *to be as Gods*, and that whatsoever entered their thoughts was *Divine*. . . . With these antediluvians *self-love* was prevalent, consequently its lusts; for they so loved themselves that they supposed themselves to be *gods*; and were so persuaded herein, that they did not acknowledge any God above themselves."

\* *Arcana Coelestia*, art. 562, 808.

This was the natural development of the principle, "Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil;" for this was the especial form of evil which continued to mature itself down to the time of the Flood, and which is referred to in the words—"God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was evil continually."

This form of evil is the one to which mankind is especially prone; for it reappeared after the Flood, in the wish to build the tower of Babel whose top should reach unto heaven. It was seen in the Jewish people, when they wished to rule alone over all the nations of the earth. It was seen among the Assyrians: as where it is said, "Thy wisdom and thy knowledge it hath perverted thee; and thou hast said in thine heart, I am, and none else beside me." It was seen among the disciples, when they wished to know who should be greatest in the kingdom. It has ever been seen in Christendom, wherever one Church has sought to domineer over another. For in this case the *man* is Lucifer, the *woman* is the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth; the *Serpent* is the Devil and Satan whose home is the bottomless pit. Even in the present day we may behold the same spirit out of the Church as well as in it. We have only to regard the doctrine of Pantheism as the *man*, and self-love as the *woman*; and when they exist simultaneously in one mind, and the doctrine of Pantheism is seen to be good for food, and pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise; presently the Secularist exclaims, that

he is Jehovah and that there is no other; the Positivist, that the collective humanity is Jehovah, and that there is no other: that this world, and this world only, is the glorious inheritance of man or of humanity, —that inheritance of which it is said—"All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." How true are the words—"Thou\* shalt be mad, for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see."

6. *And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat."*

We have said that the inner verifying faculty is an affection for truth; or a love of the truth that so it should be. But the same words express the verifying faculty of a perverted mind. Love is the test of truth in both cases; but the quality of the truth may be known from the quality of the love; the good quality as in these words,—“Hereby† we know that we are of the *truth*, if we *love* one another.” The bad by the following,‡—“The prophets prophesy *falsely*, and the priests bear rule by their means, and my people *love* to have it so.”—Hence, the first act of the mind is to perceive what is good, and from this good to determine what is true. In the present case, *knowledge* is thought to be the good, and the transition is from knowledge to wisdom; whereas, in the Paradisiacal state of the Church, it was from wisdom to knowledge, as already observed; wisdom being the guiding

\* Deut. xxviii. 34. † 1 John iii. 19. ‡ Jer. v. 31.

and governing principle in the acquisition and exercise of knowledge.

This distinction is observable in the Scriptures, where *wisdom* stands before *knowledge*, and not *knowledge* before *wisdom*. Hence wisdom is always connected with life, which is not the case always with knowledge.—“He\* giveth *wisdom* to the wise, and *knowledge* to them that know understanding.”—“I have† taught you statutes and judgments: keep, therefore, and do them; for this is your *wisdom* and *understanding* in the sight of the nations which shall hear all these statutes and say, Surely this great nation is a *wise* and *understanding* people.”—“I have‡ filled him with the Spirit of God, in *wisdom* and *understanding*.”—“The fear§ of the Lord is the beginning of *wisdom*, and the *knowledge* of the Holy is understanding.”—“*Wise*|| men lay up *knowledge*.”—“The lips¶ of the *wise* disperse *knowledge*.”—“When the *wise*\*\* is instructed he receiveth *knowledge*.”—“I neither†† learned *wisdom*, nor have the *knowledge* of the Holy.”—“God‡‡ giveth to a man that is good in His sight, *wisdom*, and *knowledge*, and joy.”—“The excellency§§ of *knowledge* is that *wisdom* giveth *life* to them that have it.”—“Thy *wisdom*||| and thy *knowledge* it hath perverted thee.”—Lastly, in the Apocrypha, “The¶¶ fear of the Lord is all *wisdom*, and in all *wisdom* is the performance of the law and *knowledge* of Him.”

\* *Daniel* ii. 21.

§ *Eccles.* i. 14.

\*\* *Proverbs* xxi. 11.

§§ *Eccle.* vii. 12.

† *Deut.* iv. 6.

|| *Proverbs* x. 14.

†† *Proverbs* xxx. 3.

||| *Isaiah* xlvii. 10.

‡ *Exod.* xxxi. 3.

¶ *Proverbs* xv. 7.

‡‡ *Eccles.* ii. 26.

¶¶ *Eccles.* xix. 20.

Now we have already observed, that Paradise represents the Adamic Church in a state of wisdom, and *hence* in a state of knowledge; but there was a state of the Church antecedently to that of Paradise, in which the order of proceeding *then* was from knowledge to wisdom. This is the order into which we are born in the present day, and it is now legitimate: but not so in Paradise; for if, after arriving at wisdom which cometh from above, it should be abandoned in favor of knowledge coming from beneath or from without, it is evident that, although this knowledge might be a knowledge of truth, it would be an inferior state; as inferior as knowledge to wisdom, as silver to gold. It would be the loss of that life which prevailed in the *golden* age, and as such would be the death of that life. In like manner the age of *brass* would be the loss of the life of the *silver* age; and the age of *iron* the loss of the life in the age of *brass*. Hence if wisdom giveth life, the loss of wisdom is the loss of that life, and this loss of life is *death*,—the death of wisdom in us.

We have thus pointed out the scale of descent of the human mind from wisdom to knowledge, from life to death. We have already shewn, that the life in Paradise consisted in a perception of the correspondence of things on earth with things in heaven; and hence in a state of heavenly wisdom, from which men contemplated the outer objects of nature; whence they had an insight, more or less, into their quality; for "whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air and to every

beast of the field." In the place of this inward perception is now substituted external knowledge. The communion with heaven is interrupted, because knowledge from without is obtained from the external world by the rational powers. Thus the *silver* age might have an external knowledge of the internal wisdom of the *golden* age, derived from oral tradition; but would no longer have a perception of this wisdom. On the contrary, it might place this wisdom in doubt; as, for instance, in regard to the spiritual meaning of particular objects, it might begin to reason whether this were so; from this state of doubt they might pass on to a state of denial; in which case the garden of Paradise would cease to be a type of heaven, or to declare the glory of God as it did before; its objects would only minister to the delights of science or of sense.

"Thoughts,"\* says a modern writer, "ferment long in society before they fully express themselves in form: they first exist as *suggestions*; then they become *doubts*; lastly, they pass into *disbelief*." This law of the human mind, which expresses the change which took place in the age of Louis XIV., is the same with that which is pointed out in the third chapter of Genesis; from which it has descended, through all ages of the world, down to modern times. Thus, in the present day, we have some theological writers who *affirm* that the wisdom of Paradise consisted in a perception of the correspondence between the things of heaven and the things of earth: some who *doubt* it: others who *deny* it. That which

\* Farrar's *Bampton Lectures*, page 234.

was at first a source of certainty, has become the most uncertain; and on the ground of its uncertainty has been repudiated altogether; the consequence of which has been, that the Church is left without any principle of Inspiration; and Science and Faith, so far from being in correspondence with each other, have come to be regarded as opposites.

*"She gave unto her husband with her, and he did eat,"* signifying that the masculine reason yielded to self-love, to the inducement to be as God knowing good and evil, hence to the persuasion that the eyes of reason would thus be opened; the real truth being, that while appearing to be opened, they were in reality blinded. For now the external mind predominated over the internal; the *ψυχή* over the *πνεῦμα*.

7. *"And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked, and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons."*

Here is another change of state. Originally the promise of the Serpent was, *Your eyes shall be opened*, or, your intellect shall be enlightened. Cornelius a Lapide observes on this passage:—

"The intellect, says Aristotle in his first book of Ethics, is a certain kind of *eye*; especially as the eye and the sight, more than all the other senses, subserve the intellect for knowledge; for from things seen arises memory, from memory experience, from experiences art or science. And therefore the meaning of the passage is this, You will become of such clear apprehension and sagacious intelligence, that you will seem to yourselves as if you had before been blind."

The same meaning of the terms may be given in the present passage. Hence the whole sentence,



apart from the context, may express either side of an antinomy, i. e., opposite meanings, and might thus be regarded as full of equivocations; for the "eyes being opened," the "nakedness," and "sewing together fig leaves," may all be taken either in a good sense, or in a bad sense; and thus the sentence may mean, either that their understanding was enlightened, and hence that they saw that they were in a state of guilt; or else, that their understanding was darkened (being deluded by a false light), and hence that they saw they were in a state of innocence.

These opposite interpretations arise from the opposite states of mind which they serve to express. They are the antinomies of allegorical interpretation, and correspond to those of moral and doctrinal statements; but are no more an evidence of the uncertainty of allegorical interpretation, than they are an evidence of the uncertainty of ethical and doctrinal teaching. For we are told that God is immutable, yet that His purposes may be changed by prayer; that our Lord came to bring peace upon earth, and yet not to bring peace but a sword; that God punishes sin, yet that sin punishes itself.—That God is immutable, is the real truth; that He is mutable, is the apparent truth, arising from the mutability of the medium through which He is beheld, or through which He effects His purposes. That our Lord came to bring peace upon the earth, is the real truth; that He came to bring not peace but a sword, is the apparent truth, arising from the persecutions and temptations through which the Christian has to pass; that God punishes sin, is the apparent truth; that sin punishes itself, is the real truth.

From these considerations we are enabled to see, how, even in the present day, persons may use the language of Scripture to express a meaning opposite to Scripture; and thus seem to be Christians, when yet they are not so. Their eyes are opened in the inverted sense, and they see that they are naked—that is, as they think, innocent. They can also sew fig-leaves together, or devise doctrines, by which is concealed from their own consciousness their real condition before God.

*"And they sewed fig leaves together and made themselves aprons."*

The *fig-tree* may be taken in a good sense, or it may be taken in a bad sense. "A tree is known by its fruits; a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Accordingly we read in *Jeremiah*,\* "Then said the Lord unto me, What seest thou, Jeremiah? And I said, Figs: the *good* figs very good; and the *evil* very evil, that cannot be eaten, they are so *evil*." "Behold† I will send upon them the sword, the famine, and the pestilence; and will make them like *vile figs*, that cannot be eaten, they are so evil." Moreover, we read of the *fig-tree* which was cursed because it bore no fruit. On the other hand, in numerous places the *fig-tree* is used in a good sense; Canaan being commended to the Jews as a land of wheat and barley, and vines and *fig-trees*. "In† that day, saith the Lord of hosts, shall ye call every man his neighbor under the vine and under

\* *Jeremiah* xxiv. 3.

† *Jeremiah* xxix. 17.

‡ *Zechariah* iii. 10.

the *fig-tree*." In the present case, the fig-trees were in Paradise; and, as such, were among those trees of the fruit of which they might eat. Now, if Paradise was a type of heaven, so must all the trees of the garden have been typical—the *fig-tree* among the number; they must, therefore, as we have already shewn, have had some spiritual meaning—that is to say, some spiritual reference to man. Accordingly, we have seen that even modern Science maintains, that all things in the three kingdoms of nature have reference to man.\*

"That† all things in nature have reference to the *human form*, is manifest from everything in the vegetable kingdom; in which kingdom all things are clothed with *leaves*, bearing flowers before they bring forth fruits; while fruits are the ultimate ends, for the sake of which prior things existed, and to which they all tend. For *leaves* in that kingdom have reference to the *lungs*, and are, as it were, in the place of respiration, for by their means juice is attracted; wherefore, a tree spoiled of its leaves bears no fruit. Hence also it is that *leaves*, in the Word, signify the *truths* which are of faith; for by truths is drawn in the vital principle whereby good is formed,"—just as by the leaves of the *fig-tree* the vital juice from out of which fruit is formed.—Now the leaves of the fig-tree were made use of on the present occasion as *girdles*; whence the signification of being girded with *fig leaves* is, that Adam and Eve were girded with those truths which are signified by these *leaves* as the Apostle says, "Stand, therefore, having

\* Tract No. V., p. 21.

† Arcana Cœlestia, 10,185.

loins girt about with *truth*," that they might be clothed, and that the shame of their nakedness might not appear.

But, on this occasion, the girdle was made use of for the purpose of concealment, not only from one another, but also from God. They had fallen into a state of which they were ashamed, and which they endeavoured to extenuate. What was this state; and what the nature of its concealment?

We have already seen how their former state represented the marriage between Christ and the Church. "Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it." Here the mutual love between Christ and his Church is set forth as the essential principle of the love between the husband and the wife; but when the Church forsakes Christ, the wife forsakes the husband—and when, as in the case of Adam and Eve, the husband yields, the marriage between the two is broken, and the love of God and of the neighbor degenerates into the love of self and of the world; whence affections, which before were sanctified, are now changed into lusts—the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life. It was the consciousness of this change that made Adam and Eve wish to conceal and excuse it, by making the faculty of reason avail itself of external truths for this purpose.

We say external truths; for arguments in extenuation of evil and error need not be falsehoods; they may be genuine truths in their external form; spiritual truths as apprehended by the external man, but hence fallacies. Truths in themselves; but truths so applied

as not to convict but to excuse, hence to conceal. Thus we read of the Devil quoting genuine truths from Scripture in the literal sense, serving either for the purposes of temptation to sin, or for excuses after the sin. There are many doctrines in Christendom, in the present day, applied to a similar purpose: those of election and reprobation for instance: "The\* Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh;"—"O† Lord, why hast thou made us to err from thy ways, and hardened our heart from thy fear?"—"Therefore‡ hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." These are apparent truths, by which a person, wrongly disposed, may be led into sin, and may afterwards justify or excuse it; they are *fig leaves* plucked from a sacred tree, but made use of to conceal nakedness or guilt. So likewise a person may lie, or steal, or covet; and excuse himself on the ground, that it is impossible to keep the commandments of God, to be perfect as our heavenly Father is perfect, for that all our righteousness is as filthy rags: that we need not die unto sin, because Christ died in our stead. Now, it is perfectly true that we cannot attain to Divine perfection, that all our righteousness is as filthy rags, and that Christ died for us; but, in all these cases, these truths are made use of to conceal, excuse, or extenuate sin.

This view of the subject is confirmed by St. Ambrose;§ for, as he says,—

"Whoever transgresses the command of God, becomes

\* Exodus vii. 13. † Isaiah lxiii. 17. ‡ Romans ix. 18.

§ *De Paradiso Liber Unus.*

spoiled and denuded of his integrity ; and being debased in his own eyes, he wishes to cover himself, as with *fig-leaves*, with vain or unsubstantial excuses which he sews together into a system of lies ; and so one saying following another, the sinner weaves a covering to conceal from himself the convictions of his conscience, and the fact of his crime. For he does but *gird leaves* about himself, who, when desiring to conceal his fault, either says it was the Devil who was the author of his sin ; or pretends that it was the allurements of the flesh ; or puts forward some other beguiler to the evil. Nay, who frequently produces cases from out of the sacred Scriptures, in which he can shew that good men have often fallen into error : pleading, should he be detected in the sin of impurity, that Abraham had a concubine, and David loved the wife of another, and made her his own wife. Thus he '*sews* to himself certain *fig-leaves*,' or precedents, from out of the prophetic Scriptures ; thinking that the fruit of a good life will never be required."

Ambrose proceeds to ask whether the Jews did not proceed to *sew fig-leaves* together to conceal their guilt, when they gave a literal instead of a spiritual interpretation to the law.

It was true that they were the chosen people of God ; yet not in the sense they imagined. It was true that God promised the posterity of Abraham, that Canaan should be to them an everlasting possession ; yet not in the sense they imagined. In general, it may be said that all apparent truths conceal within them real truths ; and hence, that in so far as any Church is in apparent truths alone, so far is real truth concealed from it, and consequently the reality of her own condition. It is the doctrine of Bishop Browne in his work upon Analogy, that we can know only apparent

truth, and that real truth is not only unknown but incomprehensible; in other words, that we may know the sensuous side of truth but not the rational, the fallacy but not the reality; whence the whole system of analogy, in its doctrinal relations, is used as a covering of fig leaves concealing the real truth. This was peculiarly the case with the Jews, whose ceremonial law hid from them the truths which lay underneath, as also the moral character and condition of the Jewish Church itself. But there was this difference between the primeval Church and the Jewish: the Jewish Church had no conscience; the primeval Church had, and such a conscience as to lead to *confession*, shewing that there were still remains in it of some principles of good.

8. "*And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day; and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden.*"

"In\* the cool (the *air* or *spirit*) of the day," an expression which some apply to the morning, some to the evening. If to the *morning*, as Swedenborg applies it, it signifies the dawn of light, and refers to the enlightenment of conscience, thus to their new state. If to the *evening*, it refers to the obscuration of the light of conscience, thus to their old state, to which indeed Augustine refers it—

"For," says he, "it was appropriate to visit them at that hour in which they had *fallen away from the light of truth*. For God, perhaps, formerly spoke to them from within, in

\* *De Genesi ad litteram.*

other utterable or unutterable ways; just as he speaks to angels, when he illustrates their minds with his unchangeable truth; in which state, the intellect knows simultaneously what, if uttered in time, is not simultaneous. I say that *perhaps* he so spoke to them; although not with so full a participation of Divine wisdom on their part as in the case of the angels; still, in however less a degree, it was according to the measure of human capacity, and with the same kind of visitation and speech, possibly, with that which is effected by the instrumentality of the creature, whether in an ecstasy of spirit by means of bodily images, or whether in some appearance presented to the senses of the body (as to the sight or hearing), as when God is seen in his angels, or heard by a voice from a cloud. On the present occasion, however, when they heard the voice of God walking in Paradise in the evening, He was visible only in the person of a creature; lest it should be thought, that the invisible and everywhere integral substance of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit appeared to their bodily senses, having a motion in time and place."

We have before observed, that "*the voice of God*" was the Divine truth, making itself known to man through some angel or angels speaking *in* man, as in the case of Zechariah; but addressing the internal reason, and from this the external mind, and descending thence into the sense of hearing, so as often to be perceived as an audible voice, as God speaking to man. The effect produced is to awaken reflection, and cause the internal reason or man to compare its present with its former state, which is now brought to recollection; and the result is, not vain-glory and self-confidence arising from having become as gods, but a sense of shame and fear, arising from a perception of being now in a state of guilt.



9. "*And the Lord God called unto Adam and said unto him, Where art thou ?*"

10. "*And he said I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked ; and I hid myself.*"

This question to Adam indicates Adam's question to himself, occasioned by reflection. "As the commandment," says Augustine, "was given to the man through whom it came to the woman, so now it is the man who is first questioned. For the commandment came from the Lord through the man to the woman; the sin from the devil, through the woman to the man." These things, says Augustine, are full of mystical significations.—The mystical significations are simply the two opposite orders of thought; the inner man reasoning from the Divine dictate to the outer man, the *ψυχή* or woman, and hence to the senses of the body; the inverted order, suggested by the serpent, being from the senses to the *ψυχή* or woman, and hence to the man or the *πνεῦμα*. It is in the *πνεῦμα* or inner man that exists the inner intuition, from which it passes downward to the *ψυχή*, and the senses. This is the order observed in the narrative, shewing that the true perception of what is *good*, and hence of what is *evil*, exists only in this order of thought; and hence it would have been of no use to begin with questioning the *woman* or the *serpent*, for without previous intuition from the inner man no question could have originated.

"Where art thou," says Ambrose, "that is, not in what *place*, but in what *state*." Before eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, they began to

question the truth of their former intuitions, and fell into a state of reasoning whether they were trustworthy or not.—"Yea hath God said?" In the present case, the former intuition returns; on which doubt disappears. "I heard thy voice in the garden"—the perceptions of truth, such as were before in the garden, have now returned; but, "We\* have heard a voice of trembling, of fear, and not of peace." Like other words, the term *fear*, having opposite meanings, gives rise to corresponding antinomies. "Perfecting† holiness in the *fear* of God;"—"There‡ is *no fear* in love; perfect love casteth out *fear*." "I was afraid," may signify therefore a good state, or it may signify a bad one; in the present case, the fear arises from guilt.

As *shame* was experienced on a former occasion, namely, in reference to perverted affections, so now is *fear* in reference to the penalty. Both these states manifest the remains of conscience, for "the§ unjust hath no fear of God before his eyes." As a sense of shame had led them to conceal their evil affections, so now fear, to conceal from themselves the consequence—viz., *spiritual death*. For the trees of the garden signified the various perceptions of truths in their several orders, and these truths are now made use of to conceal instead of to reveal their present condition. How this was effected we have already explained, namely, by converting into fallacies genuine truths.

11. "And he said, *Who told thee that thou wast*

\* *Jeremiah* xxx. 5.      † *1 Cor.* vii. 1.      ‡ *1 John* iv. 18.

§ *Psalms* xxxvi. 1; *Zephaniah* iii. 5.

*naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?"*

Who told thee? for there are now two sources of knowledge; Jehovah God, and the selfhood of the man who is as God. From which of these two sources is derived the perception of his present condition? Is it from the Tree of lives representing the intuitions derived through heaven from Jehovah God; or from the Tree of knowledge of good and evil, representing the intuitions derived from self, and thus also from the woman and serpent? Is not this sense of shame and fear, nay the very consciousness of nakedness itself, awakened by the very voice which now speaks?

We have observed that *nakedness* signifies opposites, namely, *innocence* and *guilt*. It is in the sense of *guilt* that the man now acknowledges that he is *naked*, and this acknowledgment arises from reflection upon his state. In a state of innocence the mind does not reflect upon its innocence, any more than in a state of virtue the mind reflects upon its virtuousness. A self-consciousness of this kind would arise from vanity and conceit. There is no voice from heaven to suggest to an innocent mind the idea of its innocence or nakedness; for innocence is of the life, and life is not objective but subjective. So likewise if no voice had come, i. e., no interior perception, to tell the mind that it was *naked* in the sense of *guilty*, that nakedness or guilt would have been a habit of which the mind would not have been self-conscious. The idea of *nakedness*, however, as now suggested to the mind, becomes objective as well

as subjective. In the state of innocence its nakedness was unperceived; how is it then that that nakedness comes now to be an object of self-consciousness? Does not innocence itself, when thus converted into an object of self-consciousness, become guilt? Would it not appropriate merit to itself, and lead the man to say, "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are?"

The man, therefore, now perceives that he is *naked* in the sense of *guilty*, and that he could not know this, except from the voice of Jehovah God within him. As *nakedness*, in the sense of *innocency*, is not conscious of its nakedness, so it can have no consciousness of the opposite, nay, would believe the opposite to be non-existent or impossible; as in the case of infancy, childhood, or in years of maturity, where the mind regards the evils committed by others as impossible to itself: for to *innocency* guilt seems an impossibility. In the present case the voice of Jehovah God says, "*Hast thou eaten of the Tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?*" This tree was in Paradise, and was the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Though planted in Paradise, and obvious to the eye of the mind, there was at first no lust or desire to eat of the Tree: it was afterwards that knowledge is preferred to wisdom; or rather wisdom was made to consist in knowledge.

But how could there be any knowledge of evil in Paradise; and particularly, if, in a state of *innocency*, good is ignorant of evil, and regards evil as impossible? What is the process by which the evil,

which was thought at one time to be non-existent or impossible, comes to be committed? We have said, that it is through the medium of apparent good, apparent truth, and hence apparent innocence: in other words external good, external truth, and external innocence. This was the innocence signified in the words, "*they were naked, and were not ashamed.*" But as external innocence is conversant with good and truth only in their external forms, so these forms are more or less fallacies; and through the medium of these the Serpent exercises his power of temptation over the woman, and the woman over the man. It is through the medium of these fallacies, that the evil, which was thought at first to be impossible, is at length committed; for it is made to assume the appearance of a good.

This was one reason why it was forbidden to eat of the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil in Paradise; for this would have been to pass from real truth and good to apparent truth and good. Apparent truth and good are in their order in the mind, when viewed from real good and truth; therefore apparent good and truth might exist even in Paradise, but then it would be seen to be only apparent; and to substitute it in the place of that which is real, as if it were real, was forbidden by those perceptions of Divine wisdom which were signified by the Tree of life. These are the perceptions which have now returned, and are recognized as proceeding from God.

Hence, that God did command them not to eat of

the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil, is the predominant conviction : consequently they no longer doubt that they had transgressed Divine order, and upon this conviction is founded their confession.

12. "*And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree and I did eat.*"

13. "*And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me and I did eat.*"

Clearly shewing, that they had now come to perceive that their knowledge of good and evil, instead of being genuine had been delusive. They had become as gods, but gods who were filled with shame and fear : gods who wished to hide themselves from God, being ashamed and afraid of their own wisdom. The intuition, having commenced in the inner man, could pass down into the outer ; and the outer be enabled to see, that it had acted not in submission to an inner principle but to the outermost ; hence that its external affections had not been under the control of truth, but of the senses ; and that hence arose a state of perverted love in the will, and falsity in the understanding.

14. "*And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field ; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.*"

As the origin of the true intuition was in the inner mind and thus came from within, so the origin of the false intuition was in the outer mind and came

from without. The curse, therefore, is first upon the *sensuous mind* as the *origin of the evil*.

*Cursing* is the opposite of *blessing*: the blessing on the animal creation was—"Be fruitful and multiply:" the curse therefore consisted in being barren and desolate. Hence the voice of God in the conscience, which awoke the sense of shame and fear, so that they wished to avoid contemplation of the consequences of their present condition, now leads them to perceive, that to regard the senses as the first principle from which to will and to think, would cause the Church to be barren and desolate of all genuine knowledge of good and truth, and hence of all genuine knowledge of the real nature of evil and error; that sensuous affections and delights would avert man from the knowledge of God and of himself, more than any other, as being the farthest removed from God, and calculated to place man far below even the animal creation. The way in which this would be effected was obvious. For as, in man's state of innocence, the objects of creation, presented to view by the senses, were regarded only as signs interpreted by the inner mind as having an inner signification; so, when regarded by the senses only, the inner signification would be lost, Paradise would become only a garden of the senses, and man a creature of the senses. In this case, all worship would degenerate into the worship of the objects of sense, thus of the sun, and the moon, and the stars:\* professing themselves to be wise they would become fools, and ultimately change the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image

\* Romans, first Chapter.

made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things—the very *Serpent* itself among the number. Nay, further, they would worship not only the creature which God created, but the creature which man created. They would worship gods of silver and gold, of wood and of stone.\* “The carpenter would encourage the goldsmith, and he that smootheth with the hammer him that smote the anvil, saying, It is ready for the soldering; and he would fasten it with nails that it should not be moved, and then would fall down to it, and worship it, and pray to it, and say, Deliver me, for thou art my God.” Thus would man voluntarily degrade himself to the lowest place in creation, regarding every dead and every living thing as above him; and in so doing he would curse himself above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; God giving him over to his own heart’s lusts, and to the perversion of every natural affection, with which, as a rational animal, he was endowed.

*“Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.”*

The *belly* of the serpent being that which is in contact with the earth, signifies the lowest of earthly delights; as in the case of those whose god is their belly.† The word *ἀνθρώπος*, in Greek, is compounded of words signifying *looking upwards* with the countenance, or turning the view upwards. Hence Ovid, having observed that Prometheus formed man in the image of the all-ruling Gods, adds:—

\* *Isaiah* xliv. 12, etc.

† From Parkhurst’s Greek Lexicon; *art.* *ἀνθρώπος*.



"Pronaque cum spectent animalia cetera terram,  
Os Homini sublime dedit: cœlumque tueri  
Jussit, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus."

"Thus Cicero, in the character of a Stoic, observes, that God raised men aloft from the ground, and made them *upright*; that, by viewing the heavens, they might receive the knowledge of the Gods. For men, says he, are upon the earth not merely as inhabitants, but as spectators of things above them in the heavens, the view of which belongs to no other animals.' And again; 'When God made other animals prone to feed on the ground, He made Man alone *upright*, and raised him to a view of heaven, as of his native and original habitation.' So the historian Agrippa—'The whole human race, as being sprung from the Gods, and destined to return to them, *looks upwards*.'"

Hence arises the instinctive tendency in the infant to raise itself upon its feet; an instinct which would gradually disappear in proportion as the faculty of reason in the human race became animalized; in which case the arms and hands of man would occasionally be used to serve the purposes of legs and feet.

Indeed, pride of will and intellect itself, tending, as it does, to pervert and ultimately destroy human reason, terminates its downward course only in the merely animal nature; and hence it was that Nebuchadnezzar, "when his heart was lifted up, was driven from the sons of men; and his heart was made like the *beasts*: and his dwelling was with the *wild asses*: they fed him with grass like *oxen*, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven." Dan. v. 21.

There is, however, a lower state than that which is represented by *oxen* and *wild asses*; as when it is

said,—“Our soul is bowed down to the dust, *our belly cleaveth unto the earth* ;” where the term *dust* is used to signify that which is utterly dead, and contains within it no aliment, as grass does, for the support of life. Hence also *dust* is said to be the “*serpent’s meat* ;” indicating that the sensuous mind feeds itself upon things which have no life and are incapable of supporting life.

St. Ambrose gives a similar interpretation :\*—

“If,” says he, “the wisdom of the Devil be represented by the wildest beasts, whose breasts are situated between their feet ; and if men, whose wisdom savors of earthly things, and whose minds are not elevated by any interior affection to heaven, seem to creep with their belly on the ground ; assuredly we ought not to fill *the belly of the soul* with the corruptible things of this world, but rather to satiate it with the Word of God. Well, therefore, says David, when speaking in the person of Adam, ‘My soul is bowed down to the dust ; my *belly cleaveth to the ground* ; for it does so cleave, when, in the fashion of a serpent, it feeds upon the sins of earthly-mindedness.’”

15. “*And I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed : it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.*”

The inclination of the woman had been to the *serpent*, that is, to the *senses* ; but it is now perceived that the inclination or desire of the woman should be to the *man* or to the *masculine reason*, to which, accordingly, the affections signified by the *woman* were to be subordinated. In this case, their nature would be changed, and instead of being in agreement with

\* *De Paradiso*, liber unus.

sensuous delights, would be *opposed* to them. The future *enmity* of the woman to the serpent arises, therefore, from her future subordination to her husband; and the enmity of the serpent to the woman, from the aversion of earthly and sensuous pleasures to affections thus subordinated, which are set upon things above and not upon things of the earth. These affections were to be implanted in the Church or the woman by her Husband, the second Adam. "Behold\* I give unto you power to tread upon serpents and scorpions and all the power of the enemy." . . . "The carnal† mind is enmity against God." . . . "The God‡ of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly."—By the *head* of the serpent is meant the first principles from which the sensuous or carnal mind derives its fallacies; hence the primal source of that cunning and subtlety by which it had led the external mind from its affirmative, into a sceptical, and then into a negative state.

"*Thou* (the serpent) *shalt bruise his heel*," or the hinder part of the foot. In Scripture different parts of the body are employed to signify different provinces of the mind, and different parts of the Church. Thus we read of the head, the organs of sense, the arms and hands, the heart, lungs, bowels, loins, legs, and feet, which are variously used to signify love, wisdom, power, in their several varieties and relations. In the present case mention is made of the *heel* as part of the foot, signifying *life in its lowest degree*. "The *heel*," says Philo, "is that part of the soul, which adheres to the earthly nature, and which is

\* Luke x. 19.

† Rom. viii. 7.

‡ Rom. xvi. 20.

prone to fall into the things of sense and into earthly delights.” Consequently, the *bruising of the heel*, as predicted in the case of our Saviour, were his temptations and sufferings in the lowest degree of the external life; which led to the glorification of his humanity in that particular respect; whence his *feet* were afterwards seen to be like fine brass as if they burned in a furnace; in contrast to the *heel* of the foot represented as *bruised*, or the feet of the image which were made part of iron and part of clay.

Of the sensuous life, therefore, in its enmity to the enlightened reason of the Christian, it is foretold that it would not be permitted to reign over the first principles of the Christian life, but only to wound it in its lowest external forms; while the enlightened reason of the Christian would be enabled to inflict a deadly wound upon the source of the life of the carnal mind; as will be further seen in the next verse.

And here observes Cajetan:—

“Contemplate, Oh judicious reader! these punishments with careful attention; and consider how puerile it would have been to inflict punishments on an irrational animal, such as we call a *serpent*; and hence be confirmed in a right understanding of this metaphorical discourse, both in this place and others above, where the very text itself not only invites, but compels us to adopt a metaphorical meaning.”

16. “*Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception: in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee.*”

By *conception* is meant *thought*: thus in *Daniel*,\*

\* *Daniel* iv. 5.

—"The *thoughts* upon my bed, and the visions of my head troubled me;" where the term *thoughts* is in the original *conceptions*. So in *Isaiah*, "They\* *conceive* mischief and bring forth iniquity." Hence, as a verb, the same word is used to signify to *think*. Hence also we commonly speak of *concepts*, or of *conceptions* of the mind. "In every operation of the mind," says Dr. Reid,† "in everything we call *thought*, there must be *conception*." In popular language it signifies the forming an idea of a thing. "Is there anything more certain," he asks, "than that men may have true or false *conceptions*, true or false apprehensions of things."

"What is the meaning of the passage," says Augustine, "but this? That that part of the soul which is occupied by carnal delights, whenever it wishes to overcome any evil habit, experiences difficulty and grief; and gives birth to a good habit only by being, with great care and diligence, obedient to *reason* as to the *man*; for being taught, as it were, by these very sorrows, it is converted to reason, and is willingly subservient to its commands, lest it should again subside into some evil habit? These things, therefore, which appear to us *curse*s, convey to us *precepts*, if we would not read spiritual things carnally. For the law is spiritual." *De Gen. cont. Man.*

In the twelfth Chapter of the *Apocalypse* we have a further representation of the *woman* and the *serpent*. The woman is described as being in travail and pained to be delivered. It is generally granted, that by the *woman* is here meant the *Church*; by *travailing in birth* and being *pained to be delivered*, the difficulties and sorrows which the Church experi-

\* *Isaiah* lix. 4.

† *Intellectual Powers*, Essay iv.

ences in bringing forth sons unto God—the difficulty, for instance, of causing men to love and receive the truth and thus to be born again. Moreover, even after they are born, the *serpent*, the sensuous and carnal mind, stands ready to corrupt the truth by its subtleties and false persuasions. But having attempted to enter into the mysteries of heaven, and occasioned the fall of many, it is cast down to the earth, and is held ultimately in a state of eternal subjection.

"*And thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee*"—a prophecy of good; for the desire of the woman had been to the serpent or the senses, whence also the serpent had ruled over the woman. But the time would come when this state would change, and the woman would again be subordinated to the man, or the external affections to the internal reason, which was the order of the mind in Paradise.\*

17. "*And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it, Cursed is the ground for thy sake: in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life;*

\* We cannot avoid here noticing the absurd comments of some writers upon this subject, one of whom observes on the words, "*he shall rule over thee*," that—"At their creation both were formed with equal rights, and the woman had probably as much right to *rule* as the man; but subjection to the will of her husband is one part of her *curse*."—It is satisfactory to find that the same Commentator, when he comes to explain *Ephesians* v. 22, does not regard the subjection of the Church to Christ in this light.

18. "*Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field;*

19. "*In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*"

On this subject Augustine observes; \*—

"One thing is manifest, that no one can escape this sentence; for this is what every one experiences who is born into this life, namely, a difficulty in discovering the truth, arising from our corruptible body. For as Solomon says, 'The corruptible† body presseth down the soul, and the earthly tabernacle weigheth down the mind that museth upon many things. And hardly do we guess aright at things that are upon earth, and with labor do we find the things which are before us,' etc. These are the very *labors and sorrows* which are derived to man from the earth. The *thorns and thistles* are the prickles of tortuous questions, or they are thoughts concerning provision for this life; which, for the most part, unless they are rooted up and cast away from out of the field of God, suffocate the Word so as to prevent its bringing forth fruit in man; even as the Lord says in the Gospel. And since it is of necessity that, when we are instructed concerning the truth, it is through the medium of these eyes and these ears; and it is difficult to resist the phantasies which enter into the soul through the medium of the senses (although through the same medium comes also admonition concerning the truth); therefore, in such a state of perplexity, whose is the face that does not *sweat* in the eating of his bread? a state which all the days of our life, *i. e.*, of this transitory life, we are doomed to experience.

\* *De Genesi contra Manichæos.*

† *Wisdom ix. 15.*

And this is said to him who *tills his ground*; because these things he experiences until he returns to the earth from which he was taken, that is, until the close of this life. For he who *cultivates this ground within himself*, and thus earns his *bread*, although not without labor, is enabled to endure this labor even to the end of his life; after this life, however, suffering of this kind is no longer necessary. On the other hand, he who has not cultivated his ground, and has suffered it to be overgrown with *thorns*, experiences in this life a *curse* upon his earth in all his works; and after this life will endure a fire of purgation, or eternal punishment. Thus can no one evade this sentence. We ought, however, so to act, that the curse may be experienced at least in this life only."

Now it is to be remembered that the curse upon the *man*, is the curse primarily upon the *rational faculty*, which *man* represents; this curse consists in its yielding to an affection for external things, thus in receiving its intuitions from without instead of within; and further, these external things are those derived from the serpent or the senses; and hence the curse upon the rational faculty consists in its reasoning *from* the senses, and not *to* the senses; whence all its operations are inverted. Hence also its life is inverted: inverted life is death, and the death of reason is when it is the creature of the senses. This death is its curse, which the reason then pronounces upon itself. For the reason being formed from out of the senses, and *sensuous things* being represented by *dust*, it is obvious in this case how that which is formed out of dust, returns again to dust; and how the *man*, as representative of *reason*, returns to the *dead* and *sensuous things* out of which he was formed.



And indeed, how can the rational mind pronounce upon itself a more fearful *curse* than the following?

"Science\* has shewn us that we are under the dominion of general laws, and that there is no special Providence. Nature acts with fearful uniformity: stern as fate, absolute as tyranny, merciless as death; too vast to praise, too inexplicable to worship, too inexorable to propitiate; it has no ear for prayer, no heart for sympathy, no arm to save."

"There† is hope of a tree if it be cut down, that it will sprout up again, and that the tender branch will not cease. Though the root thereof wax old in the earth, and the stock thereof die in the ground, yet through the scent of water it will bud, and bring forth buds like a plant. But man dieth and wasteth away, yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?"—"To him‡ that is joined to all the living, there is hope; for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die, but the dead know not any thing; neither have they any more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten."—"For that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other: yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity. All go unto one place: all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again."

Reason having thus sensualized itself, proceeds further to materialize itself; and hence concludes that as itself is matter, so into matter will it be resolved; and hence in its most literal sense, pronounces upon

\* See Farrar's *Bampton Lectures*, page 441.

† Job xiv. 7.

‡ Ecclesiastes ix. 4; iii. 19.

itself the *curse*, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return."

Such are the consequences of inverting the order of the human mind, pointed out to man by the voice of God speaking within him ; and warning him against those persuasions and subtleties of the *serpent*, or *carnal mind*, of which it is written—"To be *carnally minded* is *death*, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." It is remarkable that *death* is not pronounced either upon the woman or upon the serpent, but upon the man ; for it was the internal man which was receptive of life from the Tree of life ; and the true order was, that the man should give it to the woman. It was the death of this life that is now predicted ; and therefore it is that the *death* is the death of the internal or spiritual man, and hence of the external or natural mind ; i.e., of the internal life in the external man.

From these remarks it will be seen, that the narrative does not speak of *animal* life, but of *spiritual* life :\* thus not of the death of man as an animal, but of man as a living soul. As therefore the death is not the death of animal life, so neither is the resurrection from that death the resurrection unto animal life ; nor can it be said that as in Adam all as animals die, or all animals die, so in Christ shall all as animals live, or all animals live. Yet if the Fall of man was the cause of the death of animal life, so should the resurrection of man be the cause of a resurrection of animal life. And the same holds with regard to the vegetable kingdom.

\* See the *Lecture* of Professor Owen upon this subject to the Young Men's Christian Association.

20. "*And Adam called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living.*"

The desire of the woman was to be to the man; in other words, the affections of the mind were to be subordinated to reason, in which case they would bring forth those thoughts and feelings which would have in them internal life. The man therefore perceives how it is, that the external mind is made the source of life or death, according to its obedience or disobedience to the internal mind. According to the present account, the external mind was to be again brought back to a state of obedience to the internal; from which obedience alone through all future ages, spiritual life was to be attainable.

21. "*Unto Adam also and his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins and clothed them.*"

There is a well known remark of Origen upon this subject. "What ought we to think," says he, "that these coats of skins were? For it is exceedingly foolish and imbecile, as well as unworthy of God, to think that God took the skins of slain animals, or of those who had died otherwise, and then by stitching them together as a tailor does, formed them into coats."

The *coats of skins*, then, were symbolical; for, as all animals were symbolical, so were also the several parts of animals, and hence also the *skins*. Accordingly we read in *Ezekiel*—"I\* clothed thee also with brodered work, and shod thee with badger's skin, and I girded thee about with fine linen, and I covered thee with silk." So again in *Zechariah*,† Joshua is

\* Chap. xvi. 10.

† Chap. iii. 3.

represented as standing before the angel of the Lord in filthy garments, and the angel says to him, "Behold I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment." So in the *Psalms*—"The\* king's daughter is all glorious within; her clothing is of wrought gold. She shall be brought unto the king in raiment of needlework." So in the *Apocalypse*—"He† that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment."—On the other hand, our Lord warns us to beware of false prophets that come in *sheep's clothing*. No one imagines that these and other passages are to be understood literally. The *coats of skins* indicate that man in his external life, had now descended much more nearly to the animal nature; and if we conceive the skins to be of clean animals, it would signify, that man was now in a state of external good, covering over or concealing from himself both his former state of innocency, and of guilt. These skins of animals were, in the future history of the Church, to be exchanged for the beautiful garments of Jerusalem.

22. "*And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us to know good and evil; and now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live for ever,*"

23. "*Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken.*"

The man had become, in his own estimation, as *Elohim*, or as one of the *Elohim*; i.e., he was in a

\* *Psalms* xlv. 13.

† Chap. iii. 5.

state of self-love and self-intelligence; and now, there is exercised a Divine precaution, lest in this state he "*put forth his hand.*" It is well known that the *hand* signifies *power* and *ability*; in the present case power and ability derived from self. Thus, "Uzzah\* *put forth his hand* to the ark of God and took hold of it, and God smote him there for his error, and there he died by the ark of God." So again—"The† rod of the wicked shall not rest upon the lot of the righteous, lest the righteous *put forth their hands* unto iniquity." In a good sense we read—"The‡ Lord *put forth his hand* and touched my mouth." To *put forth the hand* therefore, is to act from self-derived ability and power; in the present case, to think from one's own ability and power, in consequence of becoming as Elohim, and thence knowing good and evil.

To "*eat of the tree*" is to partake of that inward perception which belongs to the internal reason. If this internal perception were now regained, the man would be inwardly an *angel* and outwardly a *serpent*; inwardly heaven, and outwardly hell. Hence would arise in his mind a tremendous conflict between good and evil; and man would suffer far more than the torments of the damned.

23. "*Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken.*"

These inmost perceptions of the mind, in virtue of which man held converse with angels, are now therefore taken away; and man is henceforth required to

\* 2 Samuel vi. 6.

† Psalm cxiv. 3.

‡ Jeremiah i. 9.

cultivate the external mind, from out of which he had been elevated into the intuitions of heavenly wisdom, but which was now perverted by the senses.

24. "*So he drove out the man, and placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way to keep the tree of life.*"

The *east of the garden of Eden* is the sunrise of heat and light, or of love and wisdom, in the mind. "*Eastward in Eden*" is where the garden was planted, and instead of the Tree of life being now visible there was perceived instead a "*flaming sword.*" These expressions were the representative forms of thought in those days; for all thinking was then performed by symbols. Hence Cherubim and a flaming sword, might as naturally have been representative forms presented to the spiritual eyes of men at this period, as they afterwards were to John in the *Revelations* when his eyes had been opened. Still these outer forms had an inner meaning.

It is very evident that the nature and tendency of the human will had now changed; and in fine, into the external affections of self-love and love of the world. If, therefore, man in his own estimation had become as a God, and so became wise and intelligent from his own power; and if at the same time he were to derive perceptions from the Tree of Life, pointing out to him that these were all evil, he would only be in a state of perpetual fear, terror, and self-condemnation; and therefore on this account also, it was in mercy to man that these higher perceptions were withheld; for "it was better for them not to have

known the way of righteousness, than after they have known it to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them ;” and therefore although the loss of the Tree of life was in one sense a curse, it was in another sense a blessing.

We have seen how the Divine Providence of the Lord may be mercifully exercised in preventing man from attaining to higher perceptions of good than he is willing to obey. We now come to explain in what that Divine Providence consists. The Lord acts through the medium of heavenly agents: in the present case these agents are denominated Cherubim, and their office is to keep the way of the Tree of life. The Cherubim, therefore, are those orders of angels through whose medium man had at first received his angelic perceptions from the Tree of life or of Divine wisdom. In place of the Cherubim another medium is substituted by man, who now thinks from without instead of from within; and, as such, that his own self-hood is as one of the Elohim, or as one of the Cherubim; for these Cherubim, as representative forms, were representative of Elohim. “He\* maketh his angels spirits; his ministers a *flaming fire*.” This *flame of fire* is the flame of Divine Love, from which the heavenly hosts, who had been in communication with man, were in their heavenly wisdom, or that of the Living Word. Now we read in the *Apocalypse*† that out of the mouth of the Lord proceeded “a *two-edged sword* to smite them that held the doctrine of Balaam;” evidently signifying the combat of the true against the false; we read also

\* Psalm civ. 4.

† Chap. ii. 12, etc.

that "out\* of the mouth of the Word of God goeth a *sharp sword*, that with it he should smite the nations," nay, that the *sword of the Spirit* is itself the Word of God. This *flaming sword* therefore represents Divine Truth as in a state of opposition to human error ; shewing that man could not now enter into heaven, except at the risk of being pierced through by the flaming sword of this Divine Truth, even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow ; the Word of God being a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart. There is now, therefore, a disruption, more or less, between heaven and earth, down to the time when the Babylonian pride of man is finally destroyed, and man perceives the truth that the Lord alone is Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, the First and the Last ; and that blessed are they that do His commandments, from obedience to which, and not from man's own self-hood, is derived the power to partake again of the Tree of life.

If now *truth* be represented by a *sword*, and apparent truth be contradictory to real truth, we have here sword against sword ; the sword of man against the sword of the Cherubim. Here we have the key to the antinomies of Scripture ; the apprehensions of truth in the external man being opposed to the perceptions of truth in the internal man, real truths being not perceptible but by the internal reason. Therefore, a merely external Church must be at war with internal truth ; and further, in so far as external truth is derived from the self-hood of man, it will be

\* Rev. xix. 15.



at war with itself. Thus even within the Church, nation will fight against nation and kingdom against kingdom. The *flame* will be that of the *odium theologicum*, and the *sword* will be that either of truth without love, or of theology without truth, i. e., the flaming sword of uncharitable or false doctrine, or both: as when we read of the going forth of the red horse,\* and “power was given to him that sat thereon to take peace from the earth, and that they should kill one another, and there was given to him a great sword.”

In conclusion: It has been said that the restoration of man from the ruins of the Fall, is the grand and ultimate object of the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian dispensations. There is, however, this difference between the Adamic and the Christian dispensation: that in the Adamic, Jehovah was the invisible God, and was made visible to man only through the medium of some angel, according to the nature of the revelation for the time being. Under the Christian dispensation, Jehovah becomes permanently visible in His own Divine manhood, which is the image of the invisible God in a fuller sense than any angel could be. Therefore the final dispensation, in which there are new heavens and a new earth, in the sense we have before explained,† renders possible a fuller revelation and consequently a fuller union of the Church with Christ than that which took place under the Adamic dispensation: for, “unto which of the angels said He at any time—Let all the angels of God worship Him.” The final dispensation, then,

\* Rev. vi. 4.

† Tract, No. VI., p. 6.

renders possible a fuller knowledge of God than the Adamic. To what extent the Church upon this earth may avail itself of this possibility, is a question into which we do not enter; but certainly the advancement in the sciences is not without a Divine meaning in regard to the Church. At the same time we observe, that whether modern Science shall prepare the way of the Lord, or whether it shall effectually close it up, depends entirely upon the use which shall be made of it. If it be regarded as the first principle of intellectual life, it will lead the Church to regard as mysticism everything beyond materialism; and as such not only to repudiate but even to nauseate all that is spiritual. But if the first principle of life be regarded as being only in that wisdom which cometh from above, and which results from eating of that Tree of life which is in the midst of the Paradise of God, then will knowledge be subordinated to wisdom, the external man to the internal, and the internal to the Lord himself, who is God over all, blessed for ever.

We have now completed the present series of Tracts on Inspiration and Interpretation. We have defined the meaning of the term *Inspiration*, and shewn that the Inspiration of Scripture consists in its internal sense; and we have practically applied this principle to the Interpretation of the first three chapters of Genesis, so as to give an example of what that internal sense is. In so doing, we have demonstrated, in opposition to that modern criticism which would destroy their Divine authority, that these chapters are Divinely inspired. It remains to be seen

whether the Church will receive or reject this evidence in proof that this part of the Scriptures is a genuine part of the revealed Word of God; my own conviction being, that there will be no peace for the Church until it returns to the spiritual interpretation of Scripture—an interpretation founded not upon fancy and imagination, but upon a diligent and devotional study of the relation between earthly and heavenly things, or between the Church upon earth and the Church in heaven; the genuine Church upon earth being no other than that which descends from God out of heaven.

---

We close the present Tract with a few observations upon the "Preface to the Third Edition" of Dr. Lee's work on *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture*; and this we do with the view of illustrating a most important subject to which Dr. Lee calls attention.

The Archdeacon remarks, that the parallel between the Divine and human natures of our Lord, and the Divine and human elements of Scripture, so generally adopted by theologians of the Church of England, and attributed to Adolphe Monod, may really be traced to Emanuel Swedenborg, and is the doctrine he pre-eminently held. This indeed is true; but when Dr. Lee traces the doctrine to a remoter source, viz., to the *Select Discourses* of J. Smith of Cambridge, and in this case quotes the original passage faithfully from this author, it is to be regretted that, in the case of Swedenborg, he does not quote from the author, nor even from the *Tract* he alludes to,\*

\* No. II. of this Series, page 25.

but from Dörner; and thus he presents us not with the genuine doctrine of Swedenborg, but with the doctrine such as it is after passing through the transmuting processes of Dr. Dörner's mind. Dörner's statement in regard to Swedenborg's doctrine of the Incarnation is simply misrepresentation.

The doctrine of Swedenborg is, that by generation from the Father, the Lord inherited a Divine nature and was inmosty Jehovah; by conception from the mother, he inherited the nature of the mother, and through the mother all the states of the Church from the time of Adam. These states were the plane, in the maternal humanity, of those temptations which he finally overcame; thus perfectly uniting the humanity with the Divinity, so as to possess a glorified or Divine humanity.

Dr. Lee says,\* that the doctrine of Swedenborg concerning the Incarnation is in close contact with the modern heresy of Mr. Irving; according to whom . . . . "It was not human nature unfallen, and pure as it came out of the hands of God, which Christ took upon him; but that nature stained and depraved by sin, which is inherited, to use the language of the Ninth Article, by every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam."—Now I am here concerned with this doctrine only as it was held by Swedenborg, from whose writings probably the idea was in this case originally taken. What then is here meant by—"naturally is engendered?" Is it intended to exclude the humanity assumed from Mary?

\* Page 18.

Let us turn to the Second Article, where it is said, that the Son which is the Word of the Father "took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin." What was this nature? Was it the nature which Adam possessed before the Fall? What says the Scripture? "*In thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed.*" In whose seed? In *the seed of Abraham*. Who are the seed of Abraham, but the children of Abraham? And were the children of Abraham unfallen? St. Bernard\* especially guards us against the doctrine which Dr. Lee is maintaining, in opposition to what he calls a modern heresy. St. Bernard says:—"In quo enim magis commendare poterat benignitatem suam, quam suscipiendo carnem *meam*?—*Meam*, inquam, *non carnem Adam*, id est, non talem ille habuit *ante culpam*."

Now I have no desire to impose a meaning of my own upon this passage: I am ready, as a reader of Swedenborg, to abide by the general explanation given by the present Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Samuel Wilberforce:†—

.... "To be truly tempted," says he, "Christ must be truly man. Unless His temptations, His sufferings and His death, were all wrought in appearance only, there must be that nature truly in Him which is capable of these accidents. And this, in its fullest signification, is the doctrine of the Catholic Church. That Christ truly did take our nature to Himself, of the very natural substance of his virgin-mother, with a body truly and really derived from hers; and as a body, so also the higher parts of our mixed nature,—a mind

\* See his *Works*, vol. i., col. 796, sermon i., on *The Epiphany*.

† *Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford in St. Mary's Church*, p. 144, etc.

and will dwelling in a reasonable soul. And to the full perception of this truth it must be noted, that the nature He took was the human nature as it was in His mother; *not*, as some have fancied, *the nature of Adam before his fall*; for how should he have obtained that nature from the Virgin Mary, who herself possessed it not? and if He had, how could He have been in all points like as we are, sin only excepted? for we know not that in Adam's body were all those sinless infirmities which dwell in ours, and which indeed we acknowledge in our Lord's."

"And herein was shewed his marvellous love 'in taking,' as St. Bernard saith, 'my flesh upon Him, my very flesh, *not that which Adam had before his fault*.'" The contrary opinion has arisen from the pious but mistaken fear, lest in allowing that Christ took the very nature of His mother, we should unawares allow that He took what was sinful; but the true answer to this apprehension is, that the Eternal Son took to Himself, in the womb of the Virgin, not a human person but humanity,—humanity, which, if it had been impersonated in one of us would have been sinful, but which could not be sinful until it was a person, and was never a person till it was in the Christ."

According to this account, the doctrine taught by Swedenborg is the real Catholic doctrine, and as such, the genuine doctrine of the Church of England, as taught in the Second Article: whatever defection from it may have since taken place.

The defection, however, is not universal. Dörner\* himself testifies that while all agree that the humanity of Christ was sinless, *modern theology* is as yet unsettled with regard to the nature of the humanity assumed in the womb of the Virgin:

\* *On the Person of Christ*, Division ii., vol. iii., p. 230.

"Unanimous as is the theology of the present time in regard to the sinlessness of Jesus; predominant as is the number of those who keep firm hold on the truth of his moral development; they are *not unanimous* as to whether the temptation and conflicts of Christ do not require that He should have attained to ethical perfection through choice and free decision; or whether, after a more physical manner, we ought not to predicate of Him an immediate impossibility of sinning. The answer to this question depends partly on the clearness and determinateness of our knowledge of the relation between the physical and ethical in general; and partly on the other question, whether the personal unity of the Logos and of the humanity of Jesus is to be deemed a thing once for all completed by the act of incarnation, or a thing still subjected to growth, on the basis of a *Unio*, that, whilst growing, had a veritable existence."

Let us now apply the doctrine of the Incarnation as held by St. Bernard, Swedenborg, and the present Bishop of Oxford, to that of the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures.

Dr. Lee maintains, that as Inspiration or the Divine influence exerted in the composition of Scripture, is the peculiar and distinctive work of the Holy Spirit,—of the Third, not the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, so this consideration alone sets aside Swedenborg's notion that the Bible is a second mode of the Incarnation,—unless indeed on the Sabellian hypothesis to which, as he assumes, Swedenborg was notoriously inclined. "At the utmost, therefore," says he, p. 12, "we should be justified were we to say in the way of *vague comparison*, that the Holy Ghost is manifest in the Old and New Testaments as

the Eternal Word was manifest in the flesh." Now I ask, what are the Old and New Testaments, but a *body*?—Nay: but would not this be to make the Holy Ghost incarnate and not the Word?—Let us see: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that Holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Was then the body which was born of Mary an incarnation or manifestation of the Holy Ghost? Or rather, is not the Holy Ghost represented as preparing a body for Him in whom should dwell the Power of the Highest? And, was not the Holy Ghost operative in preparing a *body* for Divine Truth, when influencing the writers of Scripture to form a *written body* for an indwelling Divine Spirit? And what is the Holy Spirit but the Spirit of Truth? And what is the Spirit of Truth but the Spirit of Him who is the Truth? And who is the Truth but the Lord Jesus Christ? Well then, the Spirit of Truth proceeds from the Living Word in whom is the Father, to influence the minds of the sacred writers to produce a written body of Truth which shall be the Living Word incorporate, or made manifest in the written Word. In what better way can any one be helped out of his perplexity, who thinks that if the Inspiration of Holy Scripture be the peculiar and distinctive work of the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Scriptures be a *body*, it must necessarily be the body of only the Third Person of the Trinity?

As Dr. Lee, however, though admitting the parallel between the Living and the written Word in a vague



and general sense, does not admit it in a clear and definite sense, I may be allowed to illustrate the subject by entering more into particulars.

And, first of all, let us take the statement of the *Select Discourses* ;\*—

“ *Divine Truth* hath its *humiliation* and *exinanition*, as well as its *exaltation*. *Divine Truth* becomes many times in Scripture *incarnate*, debasing itself to assume our rude conceptions, that so it might converse more freely with us, and infuse its own Divinity into us. God having been pleased herein to manifest Himself not more jealous of his own glory than He is, as I may say, zealous of our good. *Nos non habemus aures sicut Deus habet linguam*. If he should speak in the language of Eternity, who can understand Him, or interpret His meaning? Or if He should have declared His truth to us only in the way of the purest abstraction, that human souls are capable of, how should then the more rude and illiterate sort of men have been able to apprehend it? *Truth* is content, when it comes into the world, to wear our mantles, to learn our language, to conform itself as it were to our dress and fashions ; it affects not that state or *fastus* which the disdainful rhetorician sets out his style withal, *non Tarentinis aut Siculis hæc scribimus* ; but it speaks with the most idiotical sort of men in the most idiotical way, and becomes all things to all men, as every son of Truth should do for their good. Which was well observed in that old Cabbalistical axiom among the Jews, *Lumen supernum nunquam descendit sine indumento*.”

Such is the statement in which, according to Dr. Lee, we may find the first traces of Swedenborg's doctrine concerning the parallel between the Living and the Written Word. From the Cabbalists the

\* Of Prophecy, chap. i.

principle was imported into the Christian Church, and was advocated in many of the Patristical writings; where traces of it may be found long before the time of the *Select Discourses*.

For as a garment is the clothing of the body, and the body is the clothing of the soul; so the literal sense of Scripture was from early times regarded as a *body*, and the spiritual sense as a *soul*; and thus contemplated, the literal sense is the embodiment or incarnation of the spiritual. Hence observes an ancient writer :\* “The *body of Christ* may signify the *Sacred Scriptures*, in which He is contained as the *soul* in the *body*.” Again another ancient writer,† “By the words—*body of Christ*—we may understand the *Sacred Scriptures* and the *doctrine* of Christ.” Also another ancient writer,‡ “The historical *letter* of the Sacred Scriptures, both Old and New, is a *body*, but the *meaning* and *aim* of the things which are written, is the *soul*.” This author further observes that the *body* and *soul* here referred to, must be regarded as those of A MAN.

Let us see the application of this principle to the question at issue.

The Word of God contains the thoughts of God; hence the Word of God incarnate is the thought of God incarnate. Professor Max Müller had said in his *Lectures on the Science of Language*,§ “the

\* Iychnius : see Lauretus, art. *Corpus*.

† Paschasius : see *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, tom. ix., p. 125.

‡ Maximus (Monachus), *Ibid.*, tom. vii., p. 414, where this writer is somewhat diffuse upon the subject.

§ See No. V. of this Series of Tracts, p. 82.

word is the thought incarnate." If so, there is obviously an analogy between the two cases, the word in both being "*thought incarnate*." I do not see that Dr. Lee has either disproved or denied this fact;\* and as to any misuse of it which may have been made by others, this does not in the least invalidate the fact itself, nor is Swedenborg responsible for it. The word is the embodiment of the thought; hence the relation of the thought to the word is the relation of the soul to the body; and as the soul is incarnate in the body, so is the thought incarnate in the word. It was upon this principle that the Cabbalistic expositions of the Jews are known to have been founded. The Jews were, from the time probably of Moses, in possession of a true principle; but their foolish heart did not know how to apply it.

It is stated by Allen, in his *Modern Judaism*,† that "Menasseh Ben Israel, who flourished about the middle of the seventeenth century, and whom the present chief Rabbi of the Portuguese Jews in London extols as a Divine philosopher, endowed with profound learning and extreme piety, compares the Law to the *body*, the Mishna to the *soul*, and the Cabbala to the *soul of the soul*."

This relation of the letter to the spirit was a traditional philosophical principle in the old Cabbalistic school of the Jews; and whatever may be thought of the principle itself, it evidently supplied

\* See Dr. Lee's Work, p. 503, 528.

† Page 72. In this passage, *body*, *soul*, and *soul of soul*, are expressions used to signify the exterior, interior, and inmost; corresponding to Origen's doctrine of *body*, *soul*, and *spirit*.

them with a definite idea of the nature of Inspiration. Now the relation of the Divine to the human element is the relation of the soul to the body; "for as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ." The parallel is not, as some have thought, between the human nature of the Living Word and the human nature of the *writers* of the written Word; but between the human nature of the Living Word and the literal sense of the *writing*, or of the written Word itself. For as the Humanity of our Lord is a *body* to the Divinity, so the literal sense of the *writing* is a *body* to the spiritual sense, and records the states of the Church. This principle of Divine Inspiration discovers to us a definite method of interpretation, which, so far from losing itself in vague generalities, leads, as we shall now see, to very serious consequences to the Church itself; for it gives us the key to certain ominous expressions in the *Apocalypse*.

Origen, who was one of those who regarded the literal sense of Scripture as the body, and the spiritual sense as the soul, thus writes:—

"I am of opinion, that like as Christ came hidden in a body, so that by carnal minds who looked only on the outward appearance of his body, not considering the virtues with which it was endowed,—he was seen only as man; while by spiritual minds who did not attend to the outward appearance of the body, but considered the works which were performed by those virtues, he was perceived to be God: so likewise all *divine Scripture is invested with a body (incorporata)*, but especially that of the Old Testament. For a spiritual and prophetic sense of Scripture lies hid in

the history of the fact set before us: so that by persons of humble intelligence all Scripture may be understood according to the history, but by the spiritual and the perfect, according to the spiritual mystery."

Now the word above used is *incorporata*, i. e., embodied or invested with a body: the word used by me was *incarnate*: and *incarnation* is commonly defined to be *the act of assuming a body*. Well then: Is this a Catholic doctrine, or is it not? for, in the words of Dr. Lee, "This same idea is the foundation of the doctrine as to Holy Writ taught by Emanuel Swedenborg." Nay: but says Dr. Lee, "the doctrine is admissible so long as it remains *a vague generality*."—Did Origen let it remain "*a vague generality*?" Did Swedenborg? "He that hath ears to hear let him hear."

First, let us take the case of Origen. He is commenting upon the passage in *Matthew* xxiii. 27, 33. "*Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees,*" etc., etc.

"As in the case of the prophets themselves who had departed from this life, their souls and spirits were in the land of the living; so also it is to be observed, that in the prophetic writings, the narrative, in respect to the simple history, is the *body*; but the spiritual sense itself, and the *inmost* truth of the Scriptures, are the *soul* and the *spirit* which dwell in the narratives, which narratives are very simple in respect of the history. '*The sepulchres of the prophets*' we may not inaptly regard as the very letter of Scripture, and the books in which the narrative is permanently located: in like manner as the body is deposited in sepulchres. They, therefore, who understand and receive the spiritual things of the Scriptures, and their truth which is *inmost*ly concealed, have within themselves the *souls* and *spirits* of the prophets,

being themselves made, as it were, into a place for living prophets. But they who do not understand these spiritual things, nor seek them out, but attend only to the simple narrative and mere history of the fact, pay respect only to the *bodies* of the prophets which are located in the letter, and in books as it were in sepulchres. Of this character were the Pharisees who were rightly called Pharisees, *i. e.*, *cut off*; for they have cut off from the body of the history the spiritual truths of the prophets, expelling as it were the *soul* of the prophets from the *body*, and thus slaying the prophecies themselves, and making them lifeless as having nothing spiritual in them. And such are veritable hypocrites, building and adorning only the sepulchres of the prophets containing the corporeal history; for they build and adorn when they study the writings and books of the prophets. And these persons being without understanding, inasmuch as they are bestowing attention only on *dead bodies*, *i. e.*, mere historical narratives, have all the appearance of being piously employed in cultivating the memory of the prophets; but they are impious. They wish indeed to protest that they are not the associates of those who killed the prophets; while yet they add to the crimes of those who had killed them, and fill up the measure of their iniquity, by being convicted of this very fact, that after all they do not believe in Christ, whom not the mere outward history of the prophets, but their spiritual meaning makes known."

What a comment is this upon events which are taking place in these last days of the Church!

Now we are told that all the prophets are comprehended in the *Two Prophets* which are spoken of in the *Apocalypse*, and are called The Two Witnesses which *prophecy*: for instance; Dr. Wordsworth observes, that the history of these Two Witnesses is

the history of *Holy Scripture*: and that in the Vision of these Two Witnesses\* is predicted the ignominious treatment which the Word of God would receive from an ungrateful world. This Word of God he regards, with several other Commentators, as the Two Testaments, and thus as the *written Word*.

"As† it was with Christ so with His Word. It is despised and rejected by many; by prophets, princes, priests, and people. Christ was crucified on the sixth day of the week; and the Sixth Seal and the Sixth Trumpet,—that is, the last age—the eve of the everlasting Sabbath,—is marked in the Apocalypse as a time of rebuke and blasphemy against His holy Word. Its foes will exult over it as *dead*. But the Spirit of God is in it; it rises and stands erect."

"Observe‡ this expression,—*their dead body*. He does not here say *bodies*, but *body*. How is this? The Two Witnesses have but *one body*. The reason is clear. The Two Testaments are one; they are written by the same Hand: they are the words of the same Spirit."

Here the *dead body* of the Two Witnesses is said to represent that of the *written Word*. And as the Spirit of God enters afterwards into the *dead body* of these Witnesses, so it enters into the *dead body* of the *written Word*. The dead body is the letter: it is the Spirit which giveth life.§

Is it true then, or is it untrue, that they who would deny to the Scriptures the relation of *soul* and *body*, destroy both soul and body together? May

\* *Exposition of the Apocalypse*, p. 243.

† *Ibid.*, p. 250.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 246.

§ See the Third Volume of my *Spiritual Exposition of the Apocalypse*, Chap. xi., where this subject is treated more at large.

we not affirm with Dr. Wordsworth,\*—"Scripture and the Church must suffer together. It is not possible to injure the one without injuring the other. They have one and the same Lord; one and the same cause; one and the same career: and as their sufferings coincide, so also will their victory."

But further: Dr. Wordsworth observes, that the numbers in the Apocalypse† present to us certain parallelisms,—

"They shew that the *sufferings of Scripture* coincide with those of the Church, and with the empire of the Beast. . . . The *Written Word* has been treated in the same manner as the *Incarnate Word*. The Herods and Pilates of earth have conspired against it; and it has been set at nought by the Scribes and Pharisees of the Great City." . . . "And let no one be staggered or astonished, if it should be his lot to see other more outrageous insults heaped on the Word of God. We see *its present sufferings*; and so one part of the prophecy is shewn to be true: and let us remember St. John predicts, that as it *suffers* with Christ so will it rise again, and ascend, and reign with Him. Therefore let us not be offended or dismayed by its treatment on earth; but let us raise our eyes and contemplate its glory in heaven. Above all let us take heed to ourselves: let us fear the Word: let us believe the Word: let us obey the Word, or the Word will be our woe."

As the written Word is paralleled, in its sufferings, with the Living Word, so the violence offered to the Living Word points to violence offered to the written Word. Thus in the *Catena Aurea* of Aquinas

\* *Exposition of the Apocalypse*, p. 254.

† *Pages* 270, 288.



it is said, that\*—"they smite the head of Christ with a reed who speak against His Divinity, and endeavor to maintain their error by the authority of Holy Scripture, which is written by a reed"—rather, we should say, "which they converted into a reed," i.e., by false interpretations. Hence Swedenborg observes, that—"All things which are related concerning the Lord's passion, signify the mockery of Divine Truth, consequently the falsification and adulteration of *the Word*; inasmuch as the Lord, when he was in the world, was Divine Truth itself, *which in the Church is the Word*; and because the Lord was that Divine Truth in the world, He permitted the Jews to treat himself as they treated the Divine Truth or the Word, by its falsification and adulteration."

Now this parallel between the Living and Written Word supplies us with a principle of Inspiration which is an antidote to the following observation of Locke, and which is the foundation of modern Criticism. Referring to the Old and New Testament, he observes,†—

"Nor is it to be wondered that the will of God, when clothed in *words*, should be liable to that doubt and uncertainty which unavoidably attends that sort of conveyance; when even his Son, whilst clothed in the flesh, was subjected to all the frailties and inconveniences of human nature, sin excepted."

Doubt and uncertainty may pertain to uninspired language employed by men, but not to the language of which it is said—"the words that I speak unto

\* *Apocalypse Explained*, art. 627.

† *Essay on the Human Understanding*, book iii., chap. ix., § 23.

*you they are spirit and they are life.*" The genuine Word of God is a Word which conveys the thoughts of God ; and this Word, so far from being represented in the Scriptures as subjected to unavoidable frailties and inconveniences arising out of its human element, is described as going forth conquering and to conquer. It is on this principle that is founded the interpretation by Dr. Henry More of the following passage :\*—

" *And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood ; and his Name was called THE WORD OF GOD.*" "In this vision," he remarks—"You see that the *Eternal Word of God*, of which *the Holy Bible* is in some sense and some part a *Transcript*, is at last upon His Triumph adorned with many crowns."—"Here the scene of things begins in a wonderful manner to be changed, *the pure Word of God* going forth to battle, with so magnificent an attendance, against the corrupt, superstitious, idolatrous, and contradictory opinions, and fond institutes of that Antichristian body of men over whom the Pope has a special headship and sovereignty ; in order to gain an assured victory and to triumph over them."

"That the *eyes* of this Hero are said to be as a *flaming fire*, intimates his sharp-sightedness ; as it is said in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, that *the Word of God* is a *discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart*, and that there is no creature that is not manifest in his sight, but that all things lie naked and open unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do : where the *Written Word* and the *Eternal Word* are jointly spoken of, as here they seem to be in this vision, by an *Henopæia*."†

\* See his *Works*, p. 673.

† Rupertus interprets the outermost covering, or *vesture* of the

According to this account, the parallel between the Living Word and the written Word is recognized by Scripture itself, and is the fundamental principle of the narrative concerning *the Word of God* in the Apocalypse, where the parallel is embodied into a *Vision*. It is upon this principle that Swedenborg himself interprets the narrative; an interpretation which I now subjoin, reminding the reader that both\* Parkhurst and† Bishop Horsley admit, that the Person of the Word of God is the visible representative of the ever blessed Trinity.

*“And He was clothed in a vesture stained with blood, and His name is called the Word of God, signifies Divine Truth in its ultimate sense, or the Word in the letter, to which violence has been offered. By vesture is signified truth investing good; and when said of the Word, is signified the Word in its literal sense, for that is like a garment, wherewith its spiritual and celestial sense is clothed; by blood is signified violence offered to the Lord’s Divinity and the Word: the reason why this is signified is, because blood signifies the Lord’s Divine Truth in the Word, wherefore by shedding blood, is signified to offer violence to the Lord’s Divinity and his Word; by the Word of God is here signified the Word in its literal sense, for to that violence was offered, but not to the Word in its spiritual sense, because the latter sense was not known, and if it had been known, vio-*

WORD OF GOD, on which was written “King of kings and Lord of lords,” as being the *Sacred Scriptures*.

\* Hebrew Lexicon, art. *Shem*.

† *Biblical Criticism*, vol. i., p. 29.

lence would have been offered to it also; see the *Doctrine of the New Jerusalem concerning the Sacred Scripture*. That violence hath been offered to the Lord's Divinity and Word, appears manifestly from the Roman Catholic religion, and from the religion of the Reformed respecting justification by faith alone. The Roman Catholic religion maintains that the Lord's Humanity is not Divine, for which reason they transferred to themselves all things appertaining unto the Lord; also that the Word is to be interpreted only by themselves; and yet their interpretation is everywhere contrary to the Divine Truth of the Word, as was shewn in the explanation of the eighteenth or foregoing chapter. Hence it is plain that violence hath been offered to the Word by that religion: and in like manner by the religion among the Reformed respecting faith alone, for neither doth this make the Lord's Humanity Divine; it builds theology also upon a single expression of Paul falsely understood, and therefore as it were maketh of no account all that the Lord taught respecting love and charity and good works, which nevertheless are so plain, that any one who hath eyes may see. The same thing was done to the Word by the Jews; it being a religious tenet with them, that the Word was written for none but themselves, and therefore that no others were meant in it, and that the Messiah, who was to come, would exalt them above all the nations of the earth; by means of which prejudices, and many others, they falsified and adulterated everything in the Word; this is meant by the following passages in Isaiah: 'Who is this that cometh from

Edom, with stained garments from Bozrah . . . wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like Him that treadeth in the wine-fat?—whence the blood of them is sprinkled upon my garments, and I have stained all my raiment;" (lxiii. 1, 2:) by *garments* here also are signified the Divine Truths of the Word; by *Edom* is signified redness, in the present instance redness from blood; hence it is plain, that by being *clothed in a vesture stained with blood*, and *his name being called the Word of God*, is signified Divine Truth in its ultimate sense, or the Word in the letter, whereunto violence hath been offered."

DOCTRINE OF THE NEW JERUSALEM CONCERNING THE  
SACRED SCRIPTURE.

I. That Sacred Scripture, or the Word, is Divine Truth itself.—II. That there is in the Word a Spiritual Sense, which has been hitherto unknown.—III. That the Literal Sense of the Word is the Basis, the Continent, and the Firmament of its Spiritual and Celestial Senses.—IV. That Divine Truth in the Literal Sense of the Word is in its Fulness, in its Sanctity, and in its Power.—V. That the Doctrine of the Church must be drawn from the Literal Sense of the Word, and must be confirmed by it.—VI. That by means of the Literal Sense of the Word, Man has conjunction with the Lord, and Consociation with the Angels.—VII. That the Word is in all the Heavens, and that the Wisdom of Angels is derived from it.—VIII. That the Church derives its Existence from the Word, and that its Quality is according to its Understanding of the Word.—IX. That in all

the several particulars of the Word there is the Marriage of the Lord and the Church, and from it the Marriage of Goodness and Truth.—X. That Heretical Notions may be drawn from the Word, but that it is hurtful to confirm them.—XI. That the Lord came into the World to fulfil all things belonging to the Word, and by this means to become Divine Truth, or the Word in ultimates also.—XII. That before the Word which exists at the present day in the world, there was a Word which is lost.—XIII. That by means of the Word they also have light who are out of the Church, and not in possession of the Word.—XIV. That if the Word did not exist, Man would have no Knowledge of God, of Heaven and Hell, or of a Life after Death, and would be still further from any Knowledge of the Lord.

FINIS.



## APPENDIX.

---

PAGE 3.—Perrone observes: "Passim Ecclesiam societatem nuncupavimus a Christo institutam. Hæc porro societatis notio in nobis excitat ideam *corporis moralis*, seu *moralis personæ*, quæ ad instar *hominis*, seu *individui humani* viventis, agat atque operetur."—*Tractatus de Locis Theologicis*, Pars i., caput ii.

Albertus Magnus observes: "Sicut homo habet triplicem statum suæ ætatis, *infantiæ* scilicet, *virilitatis*, et *senectutis*; sic *Ecclesia* in principio fuit quasi in statu *infantiæ*, postea in statu *ætatis robustæ*, in fine erit in statu quasi *senectutis* et debilitatis magnæ."—*Prologus in Apocalypsin*.

Cornelius a Lapide makes a similar observation in his *Prolegomena* to the *Canticles*, chap. iv. Vattel speaks of a *nation* as a *moral person* in his Preliminaries to the *Law of Nations*.

PAGE 7.—On this subject a remarkable work was published in Latin, by Peyrere, or Pereira, A.D. 1655, entitled, *Præadamitæ sive Exercitatio super versibus duodecimo, decimotertio, et decimo quarto, capitis quinti Epistolæ D. Pauli ad Romanos. Quibus inducuntur Primi Homines ante Adamum conditi*.

Calmet, in his *Literal Commentary on Gen. ii. 7*, takes the following notice of this book:—

"La Peirere n'est pas le premier qui ait soutênu le système des Præadamites. On trouve dans le livre Cozai composé, dit on, par le prétendu Roi de Cozar, qu'il y avoit



chez les Indiens des édifices de cent mille ans. Il parle aussi de quelques anciens livres, où il étoit fait mention de Jambuzar, Zagrit, et de Roane qui vivoient avant Adam. Jambuzar étoit, disoit on, le precepteur d'Adam. Le Rabi Abrar assure que Giafar, Iman des Turks, qui vivoit vers l'an 770, étoit Preadamite, puis qu'il soutenoit qu'il y avoit eu trois Adam avant celui dont parle Moïse, et qu'il y en auroit encore 17, parce qu'il devoit arriver encore dans le monde 17 revolutions, qui seroient suivies d'une nouvelle race d'hommes, creés à l'imitation d'Adam et de ses descendans qui nous sont connus. Mais laissons toutes ces visions; il suffit de les exposer, pour en faire sentir tout le foible, et tout le ridicule. Si la retractation de la Peirere, si la singularité de son sentiment contraire à une tradition de plus cinq mille ans, contraire à l'Ecriture et à tout l'Antiquité; si les Ecrits qu'on a fait contre son système, ne sont pas capables d'arrêter le cours des mauvais effets qu'il peut produire; en vain nous efforcerions-nous de le refuter, nous ne pouvons rien dire de nouveau contre lui, il faut le laisser vieillir, et alors on en aura honte. Nous ne laisserons pas en passant de montrer la foiblesse de quelques-uns de ses raisonnemens."

The most recent notice of this work is to be found in the *Anthropological Review* for May, 1864, p. 109, in the article entitled "*Peyrerius and Theological Criticism.*" The following are the introductory remarks:—

"After two centuries of neglect and oblivion, the name of Isaac de la Peyrère is once more received and honored, as that of the first scholar who broke through the meshes of a groundless traditional prejudice, and proved that even in Scripture there are no decisive evidences of man's descent from a single pair; nay more, that there are distinct indications of non-Adamite races.

"The theory of La Peyrère, derived partly from Genesis

and partly from the Epistle to the Romans, was, that there had been two separate creations of man ; one on the sixth day along with the beasts, at the mere fiat of God, and the other many thousand years afterwards. The first was the creation of the Gentiles. In the first creation, man and woman are created simultaneously, and no names are given them. In the second, Adam is created out of the dust, the breath of God is breathed into his nostrils, and Eve is subsequently created out of his rib. Peyrère saw how many difficulties would thus be obviated, though these were in his time far less numerous and far less formidable than they have become, in consequence of the progress of science.

“ His system was, however, *mainly* founded on Rom. v. 12—14, from which he deduced that there were *two* classes of men. One of these—viz., the Jews, were descended from Adam, who, at his creation, had received *a law*, the violation of which brought death among his race. The other class—viz., Gentiles, could only commit *natural* sins, because they had received *no* law ; nevertheless, they too were subjected to the natural consequences of death—so that ‘death reigned from Adam to Moses, *even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.*’

“ Peyrère was two centuries before his time ; and whether we accept or reject his special theories, it is impossible not to admire his acumen, his candour, and his courage.”

PAGE 11.—Cornelius a Lapide acknowledges the connection between this dream of Nebuchadnezzar and the tradition of Hesiod concerning the several ages of the world ; but he seems unaccountably to place Daniel before Hesiod ; for he says, “ From this vision of Daniel the heathens derived their story concerning the first or Golden Age, the second or Silver Age, the third or Brazen Age, the fourth or Iron Age.” Swedenborg’s interpretation of Nebuchad-

nezzar's dream connects it immediately with the heathen tradition which probably formed a part of ancient Chaldean literature, and as such was not altogether unknown to Nebuchadnezzar. Mr. Faber notices the parallel in his *Sacred Calendar of Prophecy*, vol. ii., chap. i. He says the golden head is positively declared to be Nebuchadnezzar himself, in his quality of Sovereign of the First Empire: "THOU art this head of gold." This statement leads him off into a political explanation of the prophecy; whereas Nebuchadnezzar was addressed by Daniel not in his individual and political capacity, but in his representative or prophetic and spiritual character; thus as residing in a prophetic region, viz., in *Babylon* on the Euphrates, which was traditionally a boundary of Paradise, the first scene of the Golden Age, and where mankind were first desirous of adopting the Babylonian principle, and becoming as God, or as gods.

PAGE 19.—"The natural man of himself is in no agreement with the spiritual man, but in such a state of disagreement as to be altogether opposite. For the natural man regards and loves himself and the world, whereas the spiritual man does not regard himself and the world, except so far as is conducive to promote uses, etc. . . . The state of the natural man and of the spiritual are opposite to each other in respect of the ends which they regard: but still the two may be conjoined, and conjunction has place when the things of the external man are made subordinate and subservient to the ends regarded by the internal man. Therefore in order that man may become spiritual, it is necessary that the things of the external man be reduced to compliance, and that thus selfish and worldly ends of life be put off, and the latter put on; but this cannot be done except by mediums. . . . The first medium is affirming or affirmative of internal truth, viz., that so it is. When there is this affirmative prin-

ciple, then man is in the beginning of regeneration : good operates from the internal man, and causeth affirmation. This good cannot flow into a negative principle nor even into a doubting one, and hath no reception until this affirmative principle hath place. This good afterwards manifests itself by affection ; viz., by this, that man is affected with truth, or begins to be delighted with it ; at first in that he knows it, and next in that he acts according to it. . . . Good is continually flowing in from the Lord ; but where there is not an affirmative principle, it is not received. An affirmative principle therefore is the first medium, and as it were the first habitation of good flowing in from the Lord." . . .—*Arcana Cœlestia*, art. 3913. ♣

These remarks arise out of the psychology which is founded upon the distinction between the outer and inner man. Bishop Ellicott, in his Sermon on *The Threefold Nature of Man*, justly remarks that,—“ The ignorance of the Scripture aspects of this question, and the complete disregard which the whole subject of Biblical psychology has experienced, is no less startling than demonstrable. In but few of our recent Commentaries, or theological treatises, is there any attempt to distinguish between the characteristics of our psychic and spiritual natures.”—*Destiny of the Creature*, p. 101.

PAGE 41.—When love is placed before truth, or charity before faith, the Scripture is interpreted upon this principle. When truth is placed before love, and faith before charity, the order is inverted, and the interpretations of Scripture become inverted ; for that is placed before which ought to be behind, and that is placed behind which ought to be before.—“ Such persons altogether invert the Word ; setting that *above* which is *beneath* ; or, what is the same thing, setting that *before* or in front, which is *behind* or in the rear. For they establish it as a principle that *faith* is the essential

of the Church, and that the things appertaining to love to the Lord and charity towards our neighbor, are the fruits of faith. When yet the real case is this: if love to the Lord be compared to the *Tree of Life* in the Paradise of Eden, *charity* and its works are the *fruits* thence derived, whereas *faith* and all things appertaining thereto are merely *leaves*. Since therefore they so invert the Word as to deduce the origin of fruits not from the *tree* but from the *leaves*, it is not to be wondered at that they deny the internal sense of the Word and acknowledge only its literal sense; for from the literal sense (separated from the spiritual) any doctrinal tenet, even the most heretical, may be confirmed."—*Arcana Coelestia*, 3427. "There are degrees, like the steps of a ladder, which unite the intellectual with the sensual part of man, and by which he is enabled to ascend from the light of the world into the light of heaven."—*Ibid.*, 5114, 5144, etc. See also Tract No. IV. of this Series, p. 54.











